THE AMERICAN
CATHOLIC
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. I. APRIL, 1876. No. 2.

ACTUAL SITUATION OF THE CHURCH.

The Church and the Empires. By Henry William Wilberforce, London. Henry S. King & Co., 1874.
Devotion to the Church. By Frederic William Faber, D.D., Priest of the Oratory of St. Philip Neri. London, 1861.

A VERY common German print, to be seen in many houses of Catholics in this country, symbolizes one of the most poetical ideas and brilliant thoughts, that ever ennobled the human mind. The literal subject is the forcible entrance of the Roman army under Titus into Jerusalem; and the moment chosen by the artist, is that in which the conquering troops charge on the last remnants of the defeated Hebrews in the precincts of the temple itself. The despair of the Jews, dispersed in every part of the holy edifice, unable to stand against their foes, and choosing rather to perish by their own hands than to fall into those of the enemy; the rush of the invading legions as fearful as the blast of the tempest, and yet as orderly as the majestic march of the stars in the heavens, fix at once the attention of the beholder, and would alone render the subject one of the highest interest and most thrilling emotion. But in the right corner of the picture is just a little spot, a very small part of the interior of the huge building, where no scene of Jewish rage, or of Roman imperious sternness, can strike awe or fear and disturb the mind by the spectacle of any maddening passion. The atmosphere there is serene; and the new and never-before-seen personages who come softly to take part in the moving drama, do

not appear aware of the fury of the elements raging in their immediate neighborhood. They walk gently but majestically, dressed in long flowing robes, and wearing over them dalmatics and copes of the most simple but graceful fashion. Many sing from open books which they hold in their hands, and the harmony issuing from their lips, to judge of it by their benign countenances, evidently fills their hearts with love and hope. The great object for which they walk thus in solemn procession, is an august matron whom they surround with a visible respect due only to a heavenly queen. She is seated on an humble animal, like the one described in the gospel when Christ entered Jerusalem in triumph. On her knee she embraces several newborn infants eager to receive their nourishment from her breasts, and destined to people the earth after the despair of Jews and the harshness of Romans shall have devastated it.

The reader has already pronounced the name of this "daughter of the King." It is the Church of Christ, who came to give birth to a new people, after Judaism and Gentilism should have disappeared.

In this noble production of a great unknown artist, the symbol is so lucid and transparent that no Christian can look at it without recognizing at once the sublime truths embodied in it. Yet it required genius to express it in so striking a manner, and few writers or painters, we believe, have given of the mission of the Church, such a true, simple, and natural portraiture as this. It describes perfectly the way the kingdom of God on earth was first spread and established; and what the designer of this engraving has represented as taking place in Judea, at the destruction of Jerusalem, by the gentle and almost unperceived coming in of the Bride of Christ, in the midst of the universal tumult, happened likewise, it may be said, on the whole earth wherever the new religion penetrated.

For it is a very false view of the early spread of Christianity, which confines it almost to the provinces of the Roman Empire. In Africa, it not only conquered Egypt, but it rapidly carried the cross to the southern limits of Nubia, where the Roman arms never penetrated. Christian inscriptions and pictures are yet preserved as far as modern Khartoom, that is at a point not very remote from the lately discovered lakes of Victoria and Albert N'Yanza. It also speedily conquered a great part of Persia, which then extended to the very confines of Hindostan and of China. This is now clearly proved by the recent researches of many Orientalists. A great part of Arabia, and the whole of Ethiopia, received likewise the good tidings of the gospel, although not quite so early as the countries above mentioned. Details could be given going to prove

that the whole of Asia and of Africa would soon have embraced Christianity, had it not been for the furious onslaught of the Moslem. And everywhere was seen the spectacle of an august matron, riding gently and humbly in the midst of meek messengers and harmonious singers, calling on all nations to listen to the simple tones of a holy doctrine and a heavenly harmony.

This was to continue as long as it would take to bring the nations under the sweet yoke of her life-giving laws. But it was natural that those races who should become altogether imbued with her spirit, and profess themselves submissive to her control, should feel and manifest for her the same respect, veneration, and love, that is depicted in the engraving on the part of those who surrounded her. It was after all the Kingdom of Christ she came to establish, and if the "Son of David" was "humble and meek of heart," he was nevertheless a true ruler, and required from his subjects the acknowledgment of his authority, and the total surrendering of themselves to his sweet yoke.

At the true formation of Christendom, when all the nations of Europe professed at last the same faith, and submitted to the same gospel, it was just and proper that the same Christian life should animate not only every individual heart and private mind, but as a natural consequence, every Christian state and Catholic commonwealth. This process has been, we know, pleasantly represented by many modern historians, as the success of a plan matured cunningly by arch-plotters called popes, bishops, and kings, for the enslavement of nations. The philosophy of history is a great thing; but when it arranges in its cabinet the annals of mankind, exactly in such a manner as they might have been evolved, had those *philosophical* writers been the managers of it, and destined to profit by the plan, the whole result may be a fine Utopia and a wonderful romance; but every fair-minded reader, who has not himself formed the project of writing a philosophy of history, knows surely that the diversified events which go to form the life of nations, have never, in any corner of the world, eventuated in this fashion. A word on the subject will not detain us long, and will not be useless for the following considerations.

The race of diplomatists, project-mongers, and Utopists, has undoubtedly never been extinct in this world; but we would like that, with respect to their ultimate success, some straight answers should be given to many questions of facts, some of which might be like the following.

Not to go back to absolutely primitive times, but starting only from the universally known Roman commonwealth, what was the final success of the artful policy of those wise heads of the Senate, who were surely the most profound politicians that ever lived?

Their fine theories of liberty and power, after the Punic struggles, soon ended in the frightful anarchy of the social and civil wars, which replaced liberty by the inconceivable despotism of the empire. The new policy of Augustus brought in directly after him the revolting spectacle of the most debased nation—patricians and plebeians together—at the feet of the most abominable tyrants that ever disgraced a throne. This lasted, with the short interval of some of the Antonines, until the God of heaven, angered finally at the result of so much wisdom, sent the barbarians to put a stop to it.

In mediæval times no policy in Europe was apparently wiser than that which directed the destinies of the German Empire. Apart from the strength it received from its Catholic element, there was in it an army of legists whispering in the ears of many of its emperors cunning maxims of despotism artfully contrived to override the power of the popes, which was then acknowledged by all nations, and which alone stood in the way of the plan for bringing back in the north the splendid autocracy of the Roman Cæsars in the south. The old men among us have seen those plans finally overthrown, with the empire itself, at the simple dictation of a Corsican upstart.

This last hero is perhaps the most striking example that ever was, of the folly of human wisdom. How many vast projects were splendidly devised in his powerful brain! What an astonishing success during ten years of his short life! And what was the final result of it all? Every one sees it in prostrate and bleeding France at the end of the reign of his nephew.

There is a meteor going now through the heavens, and apparently as brilliant as the star of the great Napoleon. For those who know intimately the history of Prussia,—if they are not Christians,—it is the most absolute consecration of human wisdom and might. From a dim atom of matter three centuries ago, it has grown into a dazzling sun threatening to engulf the whole of Europe into its burning vortex. And surely the whole of it is the result of a deep scheme, not fully developed at first, but constantly enlarging and expanding itself. A scheme, too, altogether of this earth, in which higher principles of morality and right have always been carefully discarded as being of no account whatever. Our readers, we hope, will not consider this as giving the lie to our actual assertions. In fact not Christians alone, but almost all solid thinkers, have very little faith in the long continuance of the new empire.

Many other facts, ancient, modern, and actual, could be brought forward to prove that the history of man is not left to his own devising; and that his most profound wisdom turns out sooner or later to be folly. But there are, in the history of the Church, con-

vincing proofs that the immense influence she acquired in the middle ages, was not the fruit of any such deep scheming and worldly projects. At the very time that her pontiffs were most powerful, their line of action was precisely the best adapted, humanly speaking, to react against their human interests; and historians are now obliged to confess that they were always prompted by the sense of right and justice, which everybody knows is not the surest means of succeeding in this world.

No! the universal veneration which surrounded during so long a time the Father of the faithful was not and could not be the result of a wordly-minded policy, but was the due reward of immense benefits conferred on mankind. The deep attention always bestowed by Christendom, when the popes spoke and acted as the moral rulers of Europe, was not caused by a slavish spirit, fostered by a superstitious fear of their dreaded thunder; but men then knew that Christ had given them their spiritual power, and that nothing was so necessary for its exercise, and for the well-being of the Christian commonwealth, as their moral authority even in the temporal order. And what was this last crown of their tiara so much derided in later times, as a superfetation brought on by cunning schemes? It was for them personally only a heavy burden, so that it is truly a cause of surprise that men could be found willing to bear it; but it was for the Christian world the keystone of the whole edifice, which now threatens to fall into ruin, merely because it has been ruthlessly taken away. Let any fair-minded man study in all their details the lives of the most powerful popes, and then declare if their position was a pleasant one; if the Rome they created was a luxurious Babylon; and the order of their day, in the Vatican, or often in exile or flight, a reproduction of the orgies of the Cæsars on the Palatine. For what temporal object would they have been scheming the enslavement of nations, when we see that the greater was their power, the more agitated, and humanly speaking miserable, was the course of their days and the dream-haunted current of their nights? Nothing but the stern voice of duty could have constrained them to undertake so ungrateful a task. The lust of power, they say, will produce such a disposition of mind. The lust of power, we reply, will not continue long to precipitate a successive number of men into inextricable and most intolerable difficulties, unless they are allured by the brighter prospect of repose and enjoyment at least visible in the distance, when it is not within immediate reach. Who can find in the lives of the popes the least token indicating even dimly any disposition of this kind? The world did not certainly see it at the time; and the emperors of Germany, the kings of England or France, who felt aggrieved by the remonstrances or open censures of the Vicars of Christ,

did not often complain, that a tyrannical power had been set over their heads by a well-concocted policy, worldly cunning, or mere projects of self-aggrandizement. They knew then too well that their subjects would not have been deceived by these outcries. They preferred most of the time to tender humbly their own justification, based often on false pretences, subterfuges, or open untruths. In these few words we have given a short narrative of the long struggle between popes and kings. We think it is a very truthful one.

But it is nevertheless true also that in the midst of this constant agitation, troubled days and worse nights, the rulers of the Church succeeded in inoculating into the veins of European society the pure blood of religion. In spite of what can be said to the contrary, in spite of some great outrages which are the only events perceived by the common reader of those annals, it is an undoubted fact that all classes of Europe were then deeply imbued with an unhesitating faith and a profound veneration for holy things. This veneration showed itself not alone in the massive and wonderful buildings then erected all over Europe to the honor of Almighty God—surprising monuments of the grandest, noblest, and most divine belief that ever ennobled the spirit of man—not alone in the entrancing festivals of those days, going on in a glorious round through the year, either under the prodigious roofs of those mighty cathedrals, or often in the open air, through streets and squares, along roads and highways, over fields and moors—not alone in the private devotions of all, high and low, rich and poor, learned or ignorant—all classes vying with each other in their sincere efforts to prove their faith by the great and sure test of their daily actions. It was not only by such unerring testimonies as these, that European society showed itself truly Christian; but there was yet a higher proof of it, on which men do not sufficiently reflect. It was the grand idea all then had of the Church, which made of all Europe a true commonwealth, a real republic, animated everywhere with the same loyalty, the same interior spirit, the same exterior profession of the same truths.

The Church of Christ! who now feels that it is a grand personality transcending all ideas of nationalities, of particular races, and individual preferences? Alas, alas! How Europe, how the world, is divided in our days! Who will ever give us back that sublime unity of former ages? It was mainly of the Church that Dante sang in his exile, in spite of his deep attachment to his absent Florence. How he describes her in his flight through purgatory and heaven! And the schoolmen, his great teachers, what had they not said of the Bride of Christ? In what pages of their voluminous writings is she altogether absent? And the Fathers of the

early ages, even going up to the oldest, to the stern Cyprian, to the ardent Ignatius of Antioch, to the sweet and simple-minded Hermas; who will fail to find in their pages noble and tender descriptions of her greatness, her simplicity, her purity and loveliness, her invincible patience in the most arduous trials, the depth of her infallible teachings for the highest intellects, and the sweetness of her milk for the mouths of babes?

Was not then the world full of her name? and was not that name blessed by every tongue, and we may say adored by every heart? Then mankind spoke of her with but one voice: The Church of Christ! This was the supreme felicity, to belong to her. This was the direst misfortune, to be cut off from her. On the very borders of the Arctic Seas, on the frozen shores of the North Cape, the Laplander knew that he was the son of that Church to whom the Italian or the Frenchman likewise belonged. They all had the same altars, heard the same doctrine, hoped in the same reward, dreaded the same offended God, and this unanimity of feeling, of belief, of hope or fear came, flowed from the great fact that they were the children of the same mother.

Read the history of the Crusades, by which alone the Turks were prevented from enslaving Europeans. Read the primitive annals of Christian Portugal and Spain, by whom the banner of the Cross was finally unfurled over the wide ocean, to be carried in triumph all around the globe. Read the details of those first Christian colonies planted in the Canary Islands, along the forbidding coast of Guinea and Congo, and later on, in the wilds of North and South America, and say, if those heroes of God and of mankind were not animated by the same ardent and then universal feeling,—the desire of spreading the Church of Christ to the very utmost bounds of the earth. We do not speak here of some of the *conquistadores*, but of the great majority of those two nations.

Such was the power the simple idea of the Church exerted on those ardent and vigorous natures; and to obtain a true perception of it, we must persuade ourselves, that this was the main-spring of the life of most of our ancestors for at least six hundred years.

Through the Church, therefore, Christian life had penetrated to the very heart of European society, and was the great spring of action influencing millions of men, of all nationalities, of all races, of all tongues. The consequence was that the Church was everywhere established—neither by decree of any parliament, nor by the ordinances of any king, but by the common voice of mankind, merely re-echoing that of God and of Christ. To judge of the actual situation of Catholicity, which is the main object of these pages, we must just now consider, somewhat in detail, what was then the glorious position it obtained in the world.

(1.) The Church was then for all the great Teacher. Not alone for the poor and ignorant, who needed such a sure guide to enlighten their way through life, and received at least from her the clear and distinct knowledge of their origin and destiny, of their duties and rights, of their native dignity as men and brothers of Christ, of their obligation to submit to just laws and to the consecrated order of society. The Church was eminently, for all the humble classes of every commonwealth, the teacher and instructor; they heard her voice from the mouth of their pastors, from the examples of those who had preceded them, chiefly from the life of the God-Man, whose humble birth and protracted obscure life at Nazareth, whose sublime as well as simple teaching, and finally, whose passion and death were then known to all, and we may say never absent from the thoughts of the poor. Did they not see all those details pictured, sculptured, symbolized everywhere around them, in their churches, in their public monuments, in the thoroughfares and squares of their cities—even in the by-ways and lanes of their fields and waste places? The children were lulled to sleep by the simple harmony of Christmas or May carols; the ploughman whistled the same or similar ditties in opening his furrows or sowing his grain, the hope of a future harvest. The artisan, the seaman, the soldier, were then more used to such songs than to those of obscene ribaldry.

But it was not the humble classes of society only that received the teaching of the Church, and were moulded by her from the cradle and the nursery. The great and powerful themselves did not acknowledge any other teacher, and for this they have been called superstitious and priest-ridden. Read in the chronicles of those times what were the enjoyments of princes and lords at all the great festivals of the year; how they spent their Christmas, their Easter, and their days of Pentecost; what was for them the season of Lent and the time of Advent. Their general tenor of life was ruled by the calendar, and this was altogether Christian. What mockery of it has come down to the rich in these days of enlightenment! Christmas and Lent are the days of the Opera; Easter and Pentecost those of the Stock Exchange and the Brokers' Gold-room. Then with a purse well filled *per fas et nefas*, the monstrous caravanseries of fashion can be visited during summer in all the splendor of Mammon, or the old world can be set gaping at the prodigality of American spendthrifts. Who of them remembers in these days the Christian calendar, and its round of festivals and holy songs? But then it was the *fashion* not only to remember it, but also to act up to it; and this word alone—*fashion*—fully expresses how deeply the Christian spirit had entered into the body of society.

No doubt the great were then often guilty of enormities; and historians take good care to bring them to the remembrance of readers. Hence the name of "Dark Ages," which yet sticks to those times, after so many glorious vindications of them. But in spite of the numerous misdeeds of which mankind has kept the memory, this at least must be said, that the guilty knew they had violated the laws of God; and often the proudest among them were brought to the stool of repentance, and atoned for their crimes before God and man by their subsequent life of strict righteousness or even austerity. In this they acknowledged the Church as their teacher, and to her they applied for their reconciliation with outraged humanity. Is it thus that great criminals in our days seek for the peace of their consciences and their acquittal on the part of society? Crime, unfortunately, has at last invaded all classes of men; the daily registers of public and private events teem with them, often to the horror of all. We look in vain for many records of self-humiliation on the part of evil-doers, who, all of them, appear indeed hardened. This is the word!

Yet this would not suffice to show how far the Church was the true teacher. The best proof of it is to be found in the well-ascertained state of the high intellects of those days. For the mind of man was then powerful. Only ignorant people will now deny it. Have the deep mysteries of religion ever been developed with more richness and pomp? Have the intricacies of human nature been ever analyzed with more precision and accuracy? Have the great social questions, which have become so obscure for us, been at any time so universally and satisfactorily adjusted and resolved as they were then? The vastness and clear-sightedness of those noble mediæval minds strikes with wonder every one who can read and well understand their works. Men speak often in our days of the rights of the human intellect, and of the necessity to allow it to expand freely its wings. Who could claim such rights with more justice and firmness than those who gave every-day evidence of the strength and comprehensiveness of their individual minds? Yet they professed openly that it was their duty not to rely upon it, but to lean mainly on the authority of the great teacher—the Church—and they consented to become *anathema* if their doctrine deviated in the least from the normal standard of all truths, the dogmas of the Representative of Christ.

Thus the surest foundation of peace among men, namely, the unanimity of feeling and belief on all important religious and social questions, remained unshaken in the midst of the native mutability of human opinions. And those who believe that this concord of minds must produce atrophy of the intellect, and degeneracy of its faculties, have to explain the fact—so glaringly opposed to this

supposition—of a mighty generation of men of the highest intellectual order, accepting an extraneous guide for their thoughts, and yet keeping constantly in the rich storehouse of their inmost soul an overflowing treasure of the noblest conceptions and the most sublime verities. For a Christian the reason is plain: the revealed doctrine—the highest expression of the divine in man—had penetrated not only into the sensible fibres of his heart, but likewise into the highest chambers of his brain. The emotional faculties were ennobled and purified by the holiest streams of sanctity, at the same time that the intellectual powers were strengthened and developed by the most brilliant and dazzling light, which is that of God himself.

Where will you find, in our days, the same compenetration of truth and holiness in man? Alas! the bond of union between mind and mind on earth has been broken asunder; and freedom of belief has brought on anarchy of thought. Who dares call out for a still greater license of opinion? The man who does, evidently wishes for the total disseverance of truth, and the universal spread of the darkness of night. Discard entirely what remains yet of solidity in belief among us, owing to the existence of the Catholic Church, and we defy you to find out two men on earth agreeing perfectly in intellectual conceptions. The next move will be, to declare that absolute individualism of ideas is the *ne plus ultra* of strength of mind. Have they well considered the inevitable consequence? We shall then have a complete intellectual mutism, since men will be henceforth unable to understand each other. Then the last picture of the desolation of Jerusalem by the grief-stricken Prophet will be the universal portraiture of mankind with respect to the noblest of human faculties: *Sedebit solitarius et tacebit!*

But we have been carried away by our feelings; and this is not the place for pondering on the actual situation of Europe. There will be, by and by, enough to say on the subject. We return to our previous considerations on the former influence of the Church on society owing to the blessings conferred by her on mankind; and although much more could be written on her as a Teacher, we must pass on to say a word on her as a Judge.

(2.) During the whole time that Christendom existed in its strict sense, the Church was the judge of men and institutions, and this prerogative gave her as much pre-eminence in human society as did the previous one just considered.

It is not pretended—the reader is aware of it—that all or any of the civil tribunals, in Christian lands, were ever occupied by ecclesiastical judges. St. Paul tells us (Rom. xiii: 4) that it is the prince who "beareth not the sword in vain." The sword is the great

sanction of human judgments, and the hand of the priest cannot bear it. *Ecclesia abhorret a sanguine* is an axiom of canon law, never departed from in the most strict feudal times. Still the Church ought to be the great Judge in all Christian commonwealths, and she fulfils that function by bearing the code of true morality in one hand, and the sceptre of command in the other. By so doing she obtains a new way of access into the most important sphere of society, that in which all the great civil, social, and even political interests of man are practically cared for. This at least she did universally, when European society was thoroughly Christian. To decide in judgment between nation and nation, rulers and rulers, princes and subjects, individual men of every degree, was then one of the most striking prerogatives of the Church.

It is well known how this paramount right of decision in all the great concerns of mankind has been misconceived, misrepresented, and attacked. But the impartial inquiries of many learned men of our day are vindicating more and more this much-reviled power; and as the history of the popes begins at least to be written with candor, it is only those who remain behind buried in the ignorance of the last century, that will not shrink from attacking such personages as Gregory VII., Innocent III., or Boniface VIII.

The justice of the authority they exercised depends after all on a very simple question, and a question very easily answered. Did the emperors and kings at the time profess to be Christian? And as such were they subject in moral cases to the doctrinal and authoritative decisions of the Father of the Faithful? It would require, indeed, a great obliquity of judgment to accept the only answer possible to the first of these questions, and reject the evident consequence of it contained in the answer to the second. Mark it well: in the opinion of all at the time—and if Christianity is not an imposture, that opinion was based on absolute truth—Christ had given to the rulers of His Church all the authority He had himself over men and institutions. During His life He did not exercise it, as it was necessary He should appear humble and suffer death. But after His resurrection, hear what He says: "All power is given to Me in heaven and in earth." And every one must admit that those at least who acknowledge fully the claim of Christ, should willingly submit to His universal power. That power was transmitted by Him, in its entirety, to His apostles: "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you." The connection of both these texts is clear, since directly after the words of the first, the Saviour adds: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations." Thus the authority He had himself for teaching and judging all and everything on earth, He transferred to His apostles, and confirmed that power by declaring that they would receive the Holy

Ghost, the source of all light and holiness, and that the Holy Spirit would abide with them "until the consummation of the world."

The non-Christians of our days, for whom all this is a myth, are, nevertheless, bound to recognize that in the eyes of all who lived in mediæval times, it was a solemn truth, on which was based not only their individual hope of salvation, but also the safety and constitution of the State; because Christ having received "all power on earth," could not be deprived of that power even over the State, which was thus bound to submit to His laws, under pain of being cut off from Christendom. But the authority of the Son of God had been placed in the hands of the Apostles, chiefly of Peter, the Vicar of Christ, whom all men of all ranks, even of the highest, were obliged to reverence and obey, whenever from his infallible lips came any authoritative decision, not only on dogmas, but also, and much more frequently, on Christian morality; for, the belief in his infallibility does not date only from the late Council of the Vatican.

All this the men of those days firmly believed; and it was universally admitted, not only in Italy or Spain, but also in Germany, France, and England. Nothing is better calculated than such considerations as these, to show how far the Church then ruled society. In the highest regions of politics, social ethics, and international law, the voice of the Roman Pontiff was thus paramount; and it was proper it should be so, since to throw the slightest doubt over it, was the practical denial of Christianity as the foundation of the commonwealth.

There existed then, consequently, a high tribunal where judgment was solemnly rendered on all those great questions which are now left to the tender arbitrament of the sword, and the sweet persuasion of rifled cannon and wide-mouthed columbiads. Which of the two systems is more humane, and a truer index of a period of civilization? But men, it would seem, in the infantile ignorance of our days, cannot conceive the possibility of a central judgment-seat, where Divine justice should thus have her throne and render her decisions. They cannot understand how sincerity could exist in such a state of affairs. They imagine the world must then have consisted of a master juggler at the centre and millions of simpletons at the circumference. And, moreover, in their opinion, how could the court of Rome face at the same time all the points of the compass, and enter into the discussion of mighty State affairs, as well as of the intricate complication of innumerable individual cases?

Yet, what they consider as an impossibility in point of fact, has always existed, more or less; exists at this very moment, and will

surely exist to the end of time. It is only yesterday that we have seen the Sultan of Constantinople applying to the Pope to intervene in his troublesome affairs with his subjects of Herzegovina; and in 1846, that is, a few days ago, did not Italy propose outright to place the Pope at the head of a confederation of all the States of the Peninsula? But without alluding to the occasional need the nations feel of the papal power, even in our days, for the settlement of international or constitutional questions, there is yet in Rome, and there shall be forever somewhere, a judge willingly acknowledged by hundreds of millions of Christians as authorized to decide in numberless cases of conscience, as they are called, which are in fact one of the main objects for which Christ established his Church, as judge. You will look in vain for anything of the kind anywhere else on earth; and any one who has not at least turned over the pages where many of those decisions are preserved, cannot have any idea of the power of judging, which yet remains in the sure possession of the Church. As to the sincerity existing on both sides, no one has a right to question it, when the human conscience is concerned, and the Roman Church has always given proofs of her earnestness in defending her prerogatives. But it is unfortunately undeniable that this power of judging with righteousness, existing yet in our days, is absolutely nothing compared to what it was formerly.

Then the Church ruled the world by her decisions. Often did the barons of proud England, the imperial electors of stubborn Germany, the princes of the blood and peers of the realm in France —alternately the most submissive of daughters and the most troublesome of shrews—apply to the Supreme Pontiff for his interposition against the tyrannical behavior of some emperor or king. Often also did empresses and queens call on the common Father to bring back their execrable husbands to at least an outward observance of the rules of morality or common decency. Would to God that Gallicanism had not denied that power to the popes at the time of Louis XIV. and his grandson! Often too did rich and powerful cities beg of councils or pontiffs to see that their charters were not infringed by feudal barons or despotic counts. As to the number of individual applications for redress, who could count them? From this simple and too short enumeration it is easy to judge whether the lives of popes or bishops could then be idle and unprofitable. But history shows that they could and did fulfil their duty.

All this was perfectly unknown a hundred years ago; or, what was not then completely ignored by men of learning, was invariably represented as a series of usurpations and unwarranted encroachments by the ecclesiastical power. But the admirable collection

of chronicles edited in England chiefly by Ellis, the republication of memoirs and annals, undertaken in France under the auspices of Guizot, the numerous and often excellent biographies written and published in Germany, besides many learned works printed in Belgium and Italy on mediæval transactions, have raised the veil which for so long a time wrapped up in darkness those great ages of faith. Many points of detail are yet obscure, no doubt, and require still the labors of critics to elucidate them and present them in their true light. Yet the general outlines are now well ascertained, and compel the most skeptical to acknowledge the beneficial result of the power of the Church in her capacity of judge and arbitrator. At any rate, if another Voltaire appeared again, he would never dare to write anything like the *Annales de l'Empire* or *L'essai sur les moeurs et l'esprit des nations.* Such unblushing effrontery, such caricature of truth, would instantly be reprobated and hooted down as a contemptible mass of calumnies.

Men are found, however, half convinced by the more exact portraiture of those times, and open evidently to a more thorough conviction, who still hesitate to take altogether the Catholic view, on account of the perpetual wars of that troublous epoch, and the apparent uselessness of pontifical arbitration. "The theory is fine," they say, "and it ought to have produced peace, yet it did not, and there was scarcely any other period in the annals of mankind more violent and universally agitated." This remark is perfectly true, and it would be fatal to the side we advocate, if there were not great reason it should be so—a reason not only independent of the will of Roman pontiffs, but altogether opposed to their benevolent designs, which were constantly counteracted by a gigantic force which required centuries to be subdued. This was the bane of feudalism.

This system, universal at the time in Europe, was accurately copied from the organization of an army. This remark is taken from the *Introduction to Clyn's Annals*, by Very Rev. Dean Butler, and quoted more *in extenso* in the *Irish Race*. It was thus of the essence of feudal nations, to be constantly at war with each other. Society was a camp, every manor a fortress, every knight a soldier, every villein a camp-follower. Many more details could be given illustrative of this strange fact. But, from the few words just written, the reader will understand how impossible it was to abolish war in feudal nations. The only successful way would have been to abolish feudalism first. But to do this the popes were almost powerless. They had had nothing to do with its establishment. It had been imposed on Europe, in spite of them, by innumerable circumstances, the most important of these being the martial habits of Scandinavian tribes. The only thing the popes could do was—in admitting, perforce, the system—to tame

it down by the influence of religion, and draw out the teeth and claws of the wild beast, by obliging it to receive a kind of solemn consecration. Thus the pontiffs placed on the heads of emperors and kings a brilliant crown and in their hands a golden sceptre. But in doing this, they told them boldly: This has been given you by me for the good of the people, not for their oppression. The people have rights which I consecrate as well as yours. Swear that you will govern according to these principles, of which I am the judge. Should you be unfaithful, I shall take away this crown and this sceptre from you, and allow the people to choose another sovereign who shall receive instead of you these insignia of royalty.

Read the ceremonial of the consecration of emperors and kings in mediæval times, and say if this was not its meaning. But every one must admit the consequence, namely, that the constant state of war then existing cannot be laid to the charge of the popes. They often, on the contrary, openly interfered between nations to prevent their going to war, or to assuage the evils resulting from it, and did certainly all they could as far as their title of judge or arbitrator allowed them.

This brings us naturally to consider the third and last prerogative of the Church, by which she gained an immense influence over European society, and justly deserved the gratitude of mankind. This was that she should be publicly known as the avenger of wrong and the consoler of the afflicted, of all ranks and degrees. A few paragraphs will suffice for this consideration.

(3.) Of all her prerogatives, of all her sources of influence on society, there was none undoubtedly which she prized more, none which she attended to with greater care than her title of advocate and protectress of the poor. Christ himself had impressed this upon her with peculiar earnestness. He was born poor, remained poor all his life, and died in the most wretched poverty. He had blessed the poor, delighted in their company, and avoided that of the wealthy. In leaving his apostles on earth, he inspired them by his grace with the most tender affection for the poor and afflicted. They showed it directly after the first establishment of the Church in Jerusalem, by instituting purposely for that object the order of Deaconship.

The Church would have had to forget entirely the doctrine and example of her Founder, if she had for a moment been mindless of the lower classes of society. This she could not do, since she was to be forever the faithful bride of Christ. This she showed particularly during the whole of mediæval times. The chief effect of the invasions of barbarians all over Europe had been to establish everywhere a rough and rude aristocracy which, in taking forcible possession of the land, had declared at the same time that to its

possessors belonged exclusively all political and civil authority. Feudalism was born of this frightful maxim, and feudalism had thus divided at once society into only two classes of people: those who possessed everything, wealth and power, and those who remained entirely deprived of both. And this last class was far more numerous than the first. The Church at once declared herself the protectress of this most unfortunate part of mankind; and, as a natural consequence, the poor flocked eagerly to her tutelary embrace.

No more striking proof of this can be given, than to refer in general to the universal birth of what is called the commonalty in the tenth and following centuries. The conquered people, deprived not only of property in land, and consequently of any share in public affairs, but likewise of the right of any appeal to the law, since the law was not made for them, tried first to organize themselves in all the larger cities, into guilds or corporations acknowledged only by their body, and having in fact no legal existence; thus leaving them as before entirely at the mercy of the lords. They could do of themselves nothing more, and very little profit would they have derived from their plans, if the bishops had not at once stepped forward to their help. The bishops gave a legal and acknowledged shape to these informal organizations by obtaining for them charters of rights, which in time became the sure foundation of the Third Estate. Thus originated the great feature of modern times, by introducing with the clergy and gentry the great class of the commons into the organic life of European nations. To the bishops everywhere this was mainly due. The French kings of the last dynasty claimed for their ancestors the honor of having entertained this idea, and granted thus to the lower class a true charter of freedom. To a certain extent this is true; and more was done for this end by the kings in France than by those of England or by the emperors of Germany. Still, even there, in France, it is certain that the bishops were the great managers and directors of this mighty but peaceable revolution, which may be said to have entirely changed the face of Europe.

This at first appeared to have benefited only the burghers in cities, who henceforth became an important class, and were forever redeemed from that degrading pauperism and slavish condition, in which they would certainly have continued to exist, had it not been for those most liberal charters. But the benefit could not thus inure to the burghers in cities, without being felt to a certain extent by the still more wretched class of the peasants in the rural districts. Something of the advantages gained by the former was gradually communicated to the latter living in small towns and villages in the neighborhood. This was chiefly due to the influ-

ence of the monasteries then flourishing everywhere in the country, enjoying with justice a high degree of public estimation, and often visited by kings and princes, who vied with each other in enriching them with the most valuable privileges. How could the peasants in the vicinity remain without any advantage from this state of things, especially in the neighborhood of chartered cities, when each and every one of them could at any time ask and obtain admittance into those vast monastic establishments? Once received among the monks, the newcomer was sure, if he had real talent, to rise in honor and to take rank among the first within those walls. It is known that this, once obtained, opened even the gates of worldly renown and influence; and history has recorded among the great and powerful during those times the names of humble religious, who were called by kings to be their ministers of state.

It is not pretended that, if such aspirations had been generally entertained by the inmates of monasteries, great abuses would not have followed. This peculiarity is not hinted at here for the purpose of glorifying secular ambition, which was in fact totally opposed to the true monastic spirit. It is certain that the holy men who were then at the head of those establishments, dreaded such consequences as these, and tried their best to ward them off by strict regulations and a proper observance of the most humble rules of their houses. It is certain, likewise, that for many it became the sad occasion of degeneracy, and finally of ruin. But of the general effect of such peculiar circumstances at the time, with respect to the lower classes of society, there can be no possible doubt; and thus as the burghers were helped to rise in cities by the noble efforts of their bishops, so the peasants in the country were preserved from pauperism and degradation, by the constant action in their midst of most influential establishments, which have been the butt of ridicule in modern days, but were then at their acme of popularity, and enjoyed, with justice, the renown of holiness, usefulness, and true respectability.

Thus we see the Church going on in all ages, in her mission of benevolence and charity for the poor, and gaining universally their affection, by the most inestimable benefits. But so far the picture we have drawn has been only a general one. Scarcely any detail could be given, and the reader has had to supply for himself the deficiency of the description. What would be the result if a portrait could be delineated, embracing all the features of the case, and presenting the moving details of a tender affection, directed to all the miseries of mankind, and neglecting none of those misfortunes which may be the lot of any one of the children of Adam?

The description has often been attempted; never to our complete

satisfaction. It seems as impossible to crowd together everything the Church has done in that respect, as it is useless to attempt the complete delineation of the benevolent designs of Providence in creation. Try to go through both schemes, and you will soon find your imagination too cold, the sphere of your eyesight too limited, the words at your command too inexpressive, your pen and ink, in fine, but indifferent means of a mere mechanical description. Can you, in only a few pages, go through all the various phases of human society, in those lower regions of it, from which even the dream of happiness seems to be banished? Run through all the ills which our humanity is heir to; and unless you expatiate at length, and pile up detail upon detail to produce a saddening impression, the result is but inadequate to the theme, and in the end unsatisfactory. More; go on, if you can, through all the facts and particularities of this kind mentioned by the good Kenelm Digby in the three large volumes of his *Ages of Faith*, and you will find the whole, in the end, a dim, colorless, and melancholy picture, scarcely giving an idea of the grand theme expressed in these few words: *The Church was the protectress of the afflicted, the advocate of the poor, the avenger of all who suffered wrong.* See those innumerable establishments in cities for all kinds of diseases; classes of men and women entirely devoted, each to the relief of some particular kind of human misery; distant lands traversed at great cost and peril, to bring back home the captive and the slave; infants in their cradles, old men and women tottering on the brink of their graves, the object of tender sympathy and loving care. Enter into the houses of the poor, and examine if they are left without pity to their fate, as is invariably the case in pagan, or rather unchristian, countries.

Every effort that the Church, now more free and expanding, attempts in our days for the good of humanity, was then undertaken on an immense and universal scale, embracing indeed the world, and not excluding waifs and others whom the world abandons. Many in this country outside the Church, who had never before seen anything of the kind, and could not imagine that such had ever existed, express openly their admiration for our devoted sisters of the poor, mothers of mercy, and nurses of the foundling. What would be their surprise if the establishments existing at the time of the pretended Reformation, and destroyed by it, suddenly appeared again as they were then flourishing all over Europe? Their indignation would know no bounds at the thought that the infernal besom of such vandalism as that of the Reformation, had swept the earth in the name of religion and of pure doctrine. They would perhaps discover with a kind of horror, that Luther had openly thrust out of the canon of Scripture, the epistle of St.

James, because it recommends the practice of charity, because it contains such texts as the following: "Religion, pure and unspotted with God and the Father, is this: To visit the fatherless and widows in their tribulation, and to keep one's self undefiled from this world" (i: 27). "Hearken, my dearest brethren; hath not God chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom? . . . . . But you have dishonored the poor. Do not the rich oppress you by might?" (ii: 5, 6.) "Judgment without mercy to him that hath not done mercy; but mercy exalteth itself above judgment." (Ibid. 13.) "As the body without the spirit is dead, so also faith without works is dead." (Ibid. 26.)

The thought is really capable of overwhelming with astonishment every *bonâ fide* disciple of the Reformation, if he but reflect that Luther, as is well known, rejected this epistle only because it inculcates the necessity of good works, and because the kind of good works, it inculcates, is so forcibly expressed by the writer. It really looks as if there existed on the part of the father of Protestantism a deliberate intent to abolish the practice of charity, and to harden again, as in pagan times, the rich against the poor. The true bride of Christ, on the contrary, has always cherished in her heart the most affectionate pity for every kind of human misery, and has always declared with St. James, that "judgment (shall be awarded) without mercy to him that hath not done mercy; but mercy exalteth itself above judgment." And in this St. James only re-echoed the words of Christ describing the last judgment, as contained in St. Matthew, chap. xxv. It is surprising, indeed, that Luther did not expunge this also from Holy Writ, it is so like that of St. James. The thought must have struck him at the time, but he reflected, perhaps, that had he done this, his most ardent disciples would not have dared to follow him.

The previous considerations explain fully the human causes of the absolute and perfect control which the Church, in former ages, obtained over European society. But alas! how different is the spectacle we now witness, and how complete, in the exterior aspect at least, is for her the loss of her former influence! To this consideration the reader must be necessarily led, and the description just gone through can only render more impressive a sight to which men have become unfortunately habituated, and which they contemplate with a sort of stupid indifference. To speak in plain language, and state the case as it exists too evidently—not to shrink from admitting the whole truth, since it would be alike useless and foolish to do so—it is lamentably plain that the Church has entirely lost her former control over the rulers of nations; has been deprived of most of it over the intellectual part of mankind; has begun even to see the lower classes turning cold and indifferent to

her leadership. In the discussion of these three universal propositions there certainly are circumstances which admit of qualifications —we shall recognize them easily—but in general, taken as a whole, they are true, and constitute for the Church a state of existence which the world has never seen, except in her first days, to which she seems to be returning. Our ungrateful task will consist here in going into some details on each of those points. We will examine afterwards how this unfortunate state of things was brought about, and on whose responsibility rests the long series of evils it surely portends. And thus the reader may be brought to admit that what we see was the natural consequence of anterior events ardently opposed by the Church from the very start, but reduced to fact by the free will and power of evil men, by the association of those whom St. John called already in his time *Antichrists*. So that our present history could have been expected ages ago, and ought neither to surprise nor to discourage us; but, on the contrary is calculated to inflame us with a new zeal, and incite us to buckle on our armor and prepare to fight *pro aris et focis*.

The annals of the last three hundred years are pregnant with instruction in regard to the first point just laid down for our immediate consideration. At the beginning of this epoch the Church and the world were yet in the main what they had been during the previous period. The princes of the world admitted her claims. There was certainly a decline during the fourteenth century; kings were not all friendly; but no principle had yet been practically touched. Though heresy in England—through Wycliffe—and in Germany—through Huss—had already proclaimed an open revolt, and attempted to shake off the yoke of the Church, and deny boldly her hierarchical power over society, these attempts were immediately repressed, and the time-honored principles solemnly reaffirmed. But from the appearance of Luther a change is distinctly perceptible, and in our days the principles of Wycliffe and of Huss have finally prevailed, and the rulers of nations have accepted the rôle proposed to them just five hundred years ago by those two disturbers of mankind. To what results it must lead, is a question to be examined later on.

From the outset, Wycliffe went as far as erroneous doctrine could go. If the world had been ready to admit it, as it did at the time of Luther, the Church, as early as the fourteenth century, would have been forced into the position in which we now see her. The power of possessing temporal property, of exercising jurisdiction of any kind over laymen, of striking with ecclesiastical censures any Christian incurring them by his misdeeds, was openly denied by an Oxford divine of the fourteenth century. And, if the English nation had then followed its rulers, the scheme might have

been carried through, since these appeared at that time as eager as the Prussian chancellor of our day to sanction such enormities. Wycliffe, first having found some encouragement, gave a still more outrageous turn to his propositions, and taught boldly that the Roman Pontiff is not above other bishops; that bishops are not above priests; that secular clergymen or monks are *inept* to possess temporalities of any sort; that princes and lords are bound in duty to take away such temporalities from them, and not to suffer them to exercise any jurisdiction over Christians. This is, indeed, a very fair picture of our own time.

The heresiarch went, later on, much farther still, and dared to pretend that even secular princes lose their authority by sin—a doctrine far less acceptable to princes; but as he did not first make any mention of this, and of many other paradoxes against human free will, and blasphemies against the liberty and power of God; as he first confined himself to battering down at one blow all the superiority and influence the Church then enjoyed, he could not but be listened to by princes with satisfaction. Thus a council having been convened in London, in 1377, by the order of Pope Gregory XI., Wycliffe appeared before it accompanied by his open protector, the Duke of Lancaster, Regent of England during the minority of Richard II. He did not retract anything he had said; but explained away what he had written and preached, by subtlety and sophisms. The number of his friends and supporters in the aristocracy of England struck with awe the English bishops, who did not dare to pronounce against him any *censure*, and let him go with an *admonition*.

As we have previously remarked, had the English people then been prepared to renounce all the ideas of the Church they had received from their ancestors, her position would from that hour have been what it has finally become in our time; since nations seem now bent in introducing practically the ideas of Wycliffe into their religious code. Look at it in detail, and you will perceive how perfect is the identity. The great Oxford doctor of the fourteenth century declared pointedly that the Pope ought not to be above other bishops, nor the bishops above priests; and at this moment the majority of European nations, through their rulers, are earnestly engaged in the very praiseworthy occupation of reducing this doctrine to practice. Their subjects give them indeed no little trouble; and, had they themselves the good sense to look forward more carefully to what is being prepared for them, they might devote more of their time to the discovery and the crushing out of plots and conspiracies against their own thrones. They all live in the midst of other nations and rulers evidently intent on mischief, since they all have such mighty armaments, of which a

word may be said by and by. They see all around them former princes and potentates, who recently have been deprived of their authority and possessions, and who are for all the others an interesting subject of reflection and self-examination. But they probably find those subjects of meditation of too forbidding a nature to be attractive. Hence they are disposed to seize upon materials more promising for pleasure and profit, and eagerly attack both pontiff and bishops. Has not this been the main occupation of Victor Emanuel, or his government, since he succeeded to Carlo Alberto? Has not this been the noble preoccupation of His Majesty the Emperor Napoleon III., to the length of neglecting even to prepare himself for war, during the last years of his life? Is not this the great bugbear which troubles the dreams of nearly all the presidents of the South American republics, from your Francias, Rosas, and Mosqueras, to those of our own day, whose names we have not the courage to recall to memory? Not to make the enumeration too long, and tedious in the end, and to put the climax to all reflections of this kind, is not this sweeping *dictum* of the great Wycliffe, the main object of the world-embracing policy of M. de Bismarck and his Emperor of Germany? Yes, indeed! to treat the Pope as a common bishop, and each bishop as an ordinary priest, and each priest as a poor layman—this axiom of the first reformer among Englishmen has now been adopted by all the politicians of the world.

Look at the most venerable Head of Christendom, and see how the potentates of this earth have treated and are every day treating him. If the "school of respect," as Guizot called it, has not altogether perished from this world, its poor remnants ought to be surely found in the hearts of kings. For their very existence depends merely on respect, and without this "their occupation is gone." Yet, with a crown on their head, they show in their conduct towards the common Father the spirit of the mob. Did not Napoleon III. applaud inwardly his friend, M. Edmond About, jesting about "the Vatican and a garden," at the very time that the Pope was yet master of his States, and the flag of France waving at Ancona ought to have protected their whole extent under its folds? Let us say it without fear or human respect: all the princes who in our days have felt the least veneration for the Vicar of Christ were instantly denied open communion in the councils of the rulers of Europe, were in fact rejected from the companionship of their peers, preparatory to being driven away from their thrones, with the full assent, if not at the instigation of their brethren in rank. Thus deprived of all human assistance, the Pope was left at the mercy of those who had sworn in their secret meetings to rob him entirely of his power, and place him, if pos-

sible, in the position designated for him by Wycliffe five hundred years ago.

As to bishops and priests, there is no denying that the same policy is being carried out to the letter. We see it at this moment in Germany, Switzerland, and Italy; we saw it but yesterday in nearly all the republics of South and Central America, besides the great empire of Brazil; we can guess it without being wizards, from the plans of a large and influential party in England, France, and Spain. Everywhere it is the same glaring project: to drag in the mud the episcopal and priestly robes; to deprive all ecclesiastical office of its dignity, and all men of respect for it. Will they succeed? Can they succeed? No! The mob can insult, but not degrade those it tries to outrage. There is in those, whom the rites of Holy Church have consecrated, too evident a participation in the majesty of God for them to be in danger of falling into real degradation. The recoil of all those insults will necessarily fall back on the men who are guilty of them. But meanwhile these revilers of all that is holy will continue for some time yet their mad attempts, and even go on boasting, as they do openly in Italy, that their projects are favored by heaven. Let them do so, and wait!

Yet what has been just seen was only the first article of the Wycliffian theses. There were other propositions bolder still than this one. We must look at them for a moment. "Secular clergymen and monks," according to the Oxford doctor, "are *inept* to possess temporalities of any sort. Princes and lords are bound in duty to take away such temporalities from them." This great man was certainly a prophet. How could he, without the gift of vision, determine so succinctly, yet completely, the duty of princes and lords in that regard; and in two phrases only indite a programme destined to be so faithfully executed five centuries after his time?

The necessity of a τέμενος, an *ager sacer*, or glebe-land, for the subsistence of the ministers of religion, and the proper celebration of public worship, was felt, from the beginning of mankind, by all nations, without any exception whatever. We see it in Hindostan, in Central Asia, in Palestine, in Egypt, even in Greece, where, however, the true idea of the priesthood began to degenerate by depriving it of authoritative teaching. We see it in pagan Rome, whose colleges of priests were so richly endowed; and where it was so easy for Constantine to give to the Christian Church all the means of comfortable support, by transferring to popes and bishops the property primitively allotted to the pagan priesthood. Never in the history of ancient nations do we see the smallest attempt made to rob the sanctuary of at least its immovable property. In a few instances, the fact is recorded of a plunderer seizing forcibly upon the precious treasures kept in the temples; and invariably

the historians relate, how soon after he was punished for his sacrilege. But of any state taking back possession of the land consecrated to the service of religion and its ministers no mention is ever made in any ancient author that we know. If Cambyses deprived the priesthood of Egypt of any landed property, it was out of hatred to their idolatrous worship; but he left for the service of the religion which he tried to introduce, the wealth enjoyed until that time by the priests of Amun and of Osiris.

There is no need of mentioning the sacred character attached in all Christian countries to the land, buildings, and holy vessels, or furniture devoted, by the liberality of princes and of wealthy individuals, to the service of Almighty God. Wycliffe was the first to pretend that the gold and silver chalices, consecrated by the hand of pontiffs, and used only on the altar for the holiest rites, were but common gold and silver, and could without guilt be turned into coin. He was the first to assert, that land appropriated to a most holy object, and the "sacred inclosures" so celebrated formerly all over Europe and Asia, were only fields producing wheat and barley, whose proper owner was the state, which could more easily than churchmen produce two blades of cereals for each former one.

Our only wonder is that so acute a man as this Oxford doctor certainly was, did not see that his doctrine would fill with horror the great majority of the people then living. Perhaps he felt sure that he would easily obtain his object by thus enlisting on his side princes and lords, who could hope to profit by the grand operation. It is certain that Duke John of Lancaster, Percy, Grand Marshal of England, a woman even, the Princess of Wales of that epoch, declared themselves openly for the brilliant views of Wycliffe. But the odds against them were too great. The people were not yet ready for rejecting the idea of holiness as belonging to holy things, and thus the principles of the heresiarch were to remain dormant for more than another century.

Every one is aware that they became active enough in England under Henry VIII., Edward VI., and Elizabeth. Everybody knows that Germany at the same time witnessed the like spectacle of sacrilegious plunder. Later on the greediness of so-called Catholic princes and politicians was excited at the sight of the success obtained by their Protestant friends and allies. Let us consider a moment the literal fulfilment of the prophecies and principles of Wycliffe in this respect, since nothing is better calculated to represent this side at least of the actual situation of the Church. "Secular clergymen or monks are *inept* to possess temporalities of any sort;" this is the first part of the "proposition" of this leader of "modern thought." We do not know precisely how Wycliffe developed his theses, what arguments he used for their *propugnatio*, as the word then was. But

the term "*inept*," that is, incapable, unequal to, impotent in fact with regard to all the useful ends for which property is held, must have meant evidently that under their care "two blades of grass could not grow where one grew before." This great axiom of modern times was thus at first revealed to the mind of Wycliffe, to become also the most powerful argument of all recent robbers of ecclesiastical property. It is, indeed, difficult to find any other reason for all the summary proceedings instituted, during the last hundred years, against the secular clergy and the monks in their capacity of property owners.

It is certain, however, that the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was commissioned by the Pope to have the heresiarch arrested, interrogated, and tried, could have produced stronger arguments in favor of the rights of which the Church had always been in possession. There was first that possession itself, which is considered for all cases of the kind a more than sufficient title; there was, secondly, the most important consideration of the danger human society would incur, if so well-established a right of property, as that held by the Church, was placed in the least jeopardy for any reason whatever; there was, finally, the sacredness and necessity of the object for which such a system had been established among all nations. Many other arguments might be urged; those just pointed out are more than sufficient. It is probable, however, that the Canterbury Archbishop did not condescend to refer to any of them. He must have said merely: "The Church condemns all those who oppose or invade her temporal rights, and hence your propositions are deserving of condemnation." And this certainly was all-sufficient, and was considered so at the time, since the "utilitarian" theory of Wycliffe was not agreed to, and it required a whole century more to dispose the minds of men in England to its acceptance. But see, in our days, how it is triumphantly upheld: "Those lazy monks kept half at least of their lands fallow, and allowed the neighbors indiscriminately to graze their cattle upon it." What a fearful heresy against modern principles of political economy, and how wise it was to deprive them of all property, in order to make a better use of it! As to the "secular clergy," their holy functions prevent them altogether from attending to material interests. The State can provide for them as long as people wish it; for, if people do not, there is evidently no need of secular clergy. Is not this, in Europe, the prevalent theory in our days? Has not the violent seizure of ecclesiastical property become *un fait accompli*, as Frenchmen say, all over the world? Do not the secular and regular clergy at this time present everywhere the spectacle of men deprived of everything, struggling by shifts and wretched expedients to fulfil spiritual functions which absolutely

require the use of material help? No doubt some consider this as a great improvement, because the virtue of the ministers of God is thus better tried. But the wisdom of ages has never thought so; since, as we have previously seen, all nations from the beginning have believed that the servants of God in the details of His worship require permanent means, not left to the inconstant will of men, but assured against all possible events, thus placing them on the footing of real independence of a world for whose sanctification all their life is spent.

The best things, no doubt, are subject to abuse; and what the "wisdom of ages" has always upheld may be turned against the very object intended by it. If the ministers of religion ought to be placed in a position independent of the world, on a footing of respectability and consideration, above want, and consequently above the necessity of shifts and loss of time in providing for merely material wants; if all this is undeniable, and condemns openly those who have reduced the Church of God to her present earthly condition, it is certain, however, that the means placed by former nations, kings, and wealthy people, in the hands of the secular or regular clergy was not intended to be squandered in show, and personal pomp, and, above all, not in unworthy prodigalities. All this the Church has always condemned; and she, at all times, has enforced upon churchmen their responsibility in this matter, and the strict account they must render for the same before the tribunal of God. When speaking of show, and pomp, etc., we have not, of course, in view either what may be spent for the splendor of the buildings devoted to the service of God, or for the more costly ceremonies of His worship. But for churchmen, and especially for religious, to lead a life of luxury, to indulge in what we have called personal pomp, to look down from on high on the poor below, and repel them from their *sacred* persons as unworthy of their look or care—this we hold to be one of the greatest crimes a churchman can commit, especially when it is remembered that the money thus spent is called by all the Fathers and the best writers of canon law, the money of the poor, the funds of those who have none. Supposing, however, the abuse greater than it has ever been, it was not a reason for the State to appropriate to itself what did not belong to it. The remedy lay naturally in a very different course of action. There was the authority of popes, and of councils, and of holy men who, most of the time, could hold a pen in their hand, and write burning words of condemnation and reprobation. But this did not suit the rapacity of those who cared less for the reformation of abuses than for the filling of their purses under that holy pretext.

The thought is really overpowering to a Christian, when one

reflects that there is now scarcely a single spot in the world where so sacred a thing as church property has been respected. The words of Wycliffe have become prophetic, "Princes and lords must consider themselves bound in duty to take away all temporalities from ecclesiastics." This was the second part of his first thesis.

It is proper here to inquire what kind of *duty* it was, on which they thus acted. The word itself, "duty," implies that this kind of property could not be "sacred." In fact, in the eyes of Wycliffe, there was nothing in the world which could be thus designated. He went at once to the utmost limit of sacrilege, which is to deny that there can be sacrilege. The modern system, which derides the very idea of the supernatural, is the dread explanation of the sententious words of the satanic prophet of the fourteenth century. The world is only what we see, and feel, and touch; there is no mystery about it. As there can be no connection between it and heaven, there cannot be anything sacred in it. Thus every kind of religion is a sham, or at best a superstition; and man, although surrounded by mysteries which he cannot fathom, must persuade himself that there is nothing in this world mysterious, holy, sacred, because the heart of the wicked wishes that it should be so. Is not this a perfectly truthful statement of the case?

Thus the temples of God, the consecrated vessels which serve in the Christian mysteries, the land which has been set apart for the various uses of worship, all things in fact devoted to religion, are no more sacred than religion itself; and it pertains to the duty of rulers to dispose of them as circumstances may direct. Nay, more, according to the thesis, these rulers are not free to leave things *in statu quo*, and to grant a further lease of ecclesiastical property to ecclesiastics; *they must take it away from them.* This Wycliffe asserted in his time, when the very thought of it was shocking to public opinion. In our days the rulers have seen, in Europe, the importance of this duty, and public opinion has not prevented them from fulfilling it. There were a good many reasons for doing so. The first and most important one was, that it filled their coffers. All did not dare to avow it; some did, however. There was, for instance, Wenceslaus VI., King of Bohemia, who applauded Huss, when a few years later he transferred this doctrine of Wycliffe from England to Germany; and the king did not blush to state openly, that this new dogma was for him "the hen with golden eggs"—*la poule aux œufs d'or.* Those who did not feel disposed to speak so candidly, found other motives much more avowable. There was the one we hinted at: "The lazy monks did not know how to render their property valuable; they would never be industrious enough to make two blades of grass grow

where one did before." We have sufficiently spoken of this excellent reason, which could be made to apply to many other cases besides that of the monks, and open a way to confiscate at one swoop more than half the property of all the landowners in the world.

Another consideration which explains admirably this strange duty, a consideration probably intended by Wycliffe, but certainly entertained by modern rulers, is this: The possession of large estates gives naturally importance to the ecclesiastical owners. Thus the people come to look on them with respect, and even to look to them for protection. This detracts evidently from the greatness of temporal rulers, who ought to concentrate in their own persons every kind of homage, respect, consideration, importance, etc., for the good of society. In the presence of these priests, the share the rulers enjoy of all those advantages is rather a paltry one. As Napoleon I. complained in his struggle with Pius VII., the temporal rulers have only the *body* of their subjects, whilst the spiritual guides claim and obtain the *soul*. This is not proper. Let the priests be stripped of all they possess; when they are thus left naked, the people will laugh at them; and it will be a great gain for temporal rulers. Thus, the more we consider it, the more we are ready to admit that it is an imperious "duty," indeed, for the State to take away temporalities from priests.

But the best reason after all is contained in some of the previous reflections. As every kind of religion, and chiefly the Christian religion, is nothing but a sham, it is absolutely ridiculous to devote to it so many valuable things. Strauss, on his death-bed, put to himself three mighty questions, on the elucidation of which he concentrated all the great thoughts of his life. The first must suffice for us. It was this: "Are we Christians?" The answer was short but pithy; it contained but a monosyllable of two letters, namely, an emphatic "No." The same was certainly already the case with Wycliffe, as it is with his successors in the present age. This being so, it is in their opinion the most imperious, necessary, sacred duty of temporal rulers to take away entirely the temporalities of the clergy, since the religion they were intended to support is dead and gone. Nothing could be clearer.

After this solemn duty had been religiously performed for nearly the whole of Europe, there remained yet a little spot in Central Italy consecrated to religion and to God, in the person of the Supreme Pontiff. Some ceremony was evidently required to end the whole affair; and this was done in two *scenes*. The first protracted to the length of thirteen months, or thereabout, in 1861–62; the other, lasting only one memorable day, in September, 1870. That Europe was not overwhelmed with shame on both occasions, is

certainly a sign that she is altogether proof against it. Some details are required here, as people seem to have already absolutely forgotten at least the first of those occurrences.

This one was, in fact, a solemn comedy in which, the Pope being the victim, His Majesty the Emperor Napoleon III., and the then Piedmontese King, Victor Emanuel, were the chief actors. There is no need of saying that England and other European witnesses of the disgraceful drama applauded to their heart's content. To render more imposing the stage effect, as "diplomatic difficulties had been created for France by the Italian question"—says M. Vapereau in his *Dictionnaire des Contemporains*—M. Thouvenel was called back from Constantinople, where he was ambassador, to take the place of Walewsky as Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. It must have been in a freak of drollery that His Majesty Napoleon III. took him from the Sultan to charge him with the duty of unravelling the "diplomatic difficulties of the Italian question;" that is to say, the still disputed point of the temporal power of the Pope. Charles Jean Marie Felix La Valette, a French diplomatist, senator, etc., etc., was appointed somewhat later minister plenipotentiary near the Holy See, in lieu of the Duke of Grammont, too honest a man to be an actor in this comedy. M. Thouvenel could say that he had a *fidus Achates* in M. La Valette. This last nomination was made at the end of August, 1861. Everything was now prepared by the robbers to compel their victim to consent to be robbed. For this, in fact, was the object of the operation; in which the success, however, did not equal the hope. We speak in plain terms; they are the only ones fitting the occasion.

What a fine comedy could be written merely by copying the diplomatic notes sent from Paris by M. Thouvenel, and presented with due solemnity to Cardinal Antonelli by M. La Valette, with the answers of the Cardinal! The whole gist of the play would be contained in the few remarks made by a writer of the *Correspondant*, of the same date, February, 1862:

"Would you dare in private life to declare to a man that you come on the part of the scoundrel who has robbed him of half his goods, to ask of him the surrender of the rest? Would you dare in a military contest to propose to a soldier who defends his last and strongest fortress, to give it up without a blow, because forsooth others have been taken away from him by treachery?"

This was precisely what M. La Valette went to Rome for, sent there by Napoleon III., in behalf of Victor Emanuel. And what was still more ludicrous, all anti-papal writers of the time exclaimed with a kind of holy horror: "What stubbornness! what obstinacy! what a dogged *immobility* on the part of this Pope! Down with that old man who refuses to yield!" This was the

concordant note rung by all the *liberal* papers of France, England, Italy, Germany, etc. Noble chorus, indeed, of the drama!

M. de la Guéronnière, who was then the great *amanuensis* of His Majesty Napoleon III., wrote, it seems, a pamphlet on the subject, as serious in the expression as it was in fact ludicrous in the thoughts, whose whole object was to insist on the criminal absurdity of such stubbornness on the part of the Pope. The Bishop of Orleans, to answer it, had only to remark that, if the Pope was unyielding, Piedmont was yet more so. But that, from the beginning of the contest, if the Pontiff had always remained firm, France, then his great ally, had always given way and obliged the Pope finally to come down. Thus the *obstinacy* of Piedmont had gained for it successively the Romagna, Tuscany, the Marches and Umbria, and finally Naples. Meanwhile the *obstinacy* of the Pope had reduced him in the end to the insignificant patrimony of St. Peter, owing to the facile condescension of France for Italy. The pen of Mgr. Dupanloup was, as usual, trenchant and convincing. But it was a pity that in his position he could not use open irony, and exhibit, above board, the whole scheme of the comedy.

We have said a word of the rôle enacted by France, or rather by Napoleon, who appeared to be the only support of the Pontiff and was in fact his greatest enemy; who had placed Thouvenel at the head of his foreign affairs, and La Valette near the sovereign whom he intended to rob of the remainder of his States. The Bishop of Orleans has told us how successfully he had previously neutralized the firmness of the Pontiff, and given to Piedmont the whole of Italy, except Rome. We see him on this occasion using his Minister of Foreign Affairs, and his Roman ambassador for the same noble object of swindling the Pope out of the rest, thus reducing to naught his *obstinacy*. The whole would appear, not ludicrous indeed but odious, if all their diplomatic correspondence could be published in these pages. We read it at the time, but cannot now lay our hands upon it. We are positive, however, that in several of those notes of Thouvenel, lessons were openly given to the Pope, not only in past history, but—would you believe it?—in theology. The Pontiff from the first moment had uttered his famous *non possumus;* and M. Thouvenel could, of course, prove to him that he was in error. Past history and the doctrine of sound theology allowed the Pope to surrender the temporalities of the Church; and his *non possumus* was in fact—a lie. To this had French diplomacy come down! What interest had Napoleon in taking on himself such a disgraceful task? He was not then working for France, but for Italy; he was thus fashioning a new nationality of thirty millions of souls, whose gratitude to the Bonaparte dynasty was indeed short-lived, as every one

of us knows. He was in truth fulfilling once more in his precious person, the celebrated adage: *Quos vult Deus perdere, dementat.* This comedy, therefore, whose first scene we have thus begun to develop, turned out to be a tragedy for France. But what was it for Italy itself, or for Victor Emanuel, who must be there its representative man? This part of the play deserves some elucidation at our hands. It was something more than a comedy. It can be called a spectacular drama of the *bouffe* order. Here we speak seriously.

His Majesty, the King of Piedmont, was of course convinced that the plan would be successfully carried out. When the curtain should fall, he would cry out, *plaudite cives*, as the Pontiff would be stripped of everything. But his great friend of Paris wanted that some ceremony should be observed in the proceedings. There was to be not only a kind of courtesy in the act of stripping, but moreover it was necessary for what remained of Catholic opinion in Europe, that in the operation there should be a promise of *guarentigie*. This is the Italian word. Let us see a little more in detail, how the various actors fulfilled their rôle around Rome. And here we protest that we are writing history; nothing is exaggerated or presented in a false light. Our limits, on the contrary, prevent us from saying enough, and much more could be added. If occasionally it looks like a satire, it is the fault of the actors themselves, not of the writer. When men strut on the great stage of the world, bearing on their persons the mark of the most detestable hypocrisy, when the disguise is so poor that their real features can be seen through the decayed silk that covers their face, the satire on their personality consists in their own acting; and the more faithful is the rendering of the scene by a strict historian, the more damning for them becomes his impartial pen. If it were not so, Cardinal Wiseman himself would be called a satirical author, who, writing at that time "on the situation of the Pope," did not hesitate to say: "His tranquillity and happiness have become the sport of those whose duty it was to secure them at any sacrifice. It is a matter of daily and fluctuating rumor, whether or not he is to be handed over from one calling himself his son—Napoleon—to another boasting of the same title—Victor Emanuel—who were only haggling about the terms of the transfer. . . . . He is now left hanging in what is intended to be an ignominious suspense, whilst the dice are cast by political gamesters for his seamless robe of state, which two conjointly may never wear—for that capital of the Christian world, the seat of his eternal pontificate—to see whose it shall be." At the time the Cardinal wrote, the promise of Napoleon to Victor Emanuel was not yet known, and people hesitated as to the way the plum would fall. But with this difference

that our remarks must be more pointed, as the veil has been entirely lifted up; they need not be more pungent than these words of the dignified Wiseman.

Ricasoli—the successor of Cavour, who on his death-bed promised the Italians the possession of Rome within six months—was the first to give, in the session of 1861, in the Italian Parliament, a hint about the agreement finally come to between Napoleon and Victor Emanuel. "Our wish," he said, "is to restore Rome to Italy, without depriving the Church of any of its grandeur, or the Pope of his independence." As everybody knows perfectly how deep was the anxiety of M. Ricasoli for "the grandeur of the Church," and "the independence of the Pope," these words of his address to the Italian deputies were perfectly useless, or rather they must have been intended to raise a smile on the face of the "honorable" men to whom he spoke. He insisted on it, however; and a little lower down, he explained better his meaning. "We wish to go to Rome," he said, "in accord with France, not destroying, but building up, and at the same time opening to the Church a way of *reform* by giving her that liberty and independence which will invite her to *regeneration*—a task to be accomplished by the purity of *religious* sentiment and *simplicity of manners*, by *severity of discipline*, and by the frank and loyal abandonment of that power which is *opposed* to the great idea of her *institution*." We need not say that the italics are ours. It is the only comment needed on the words of this artistic comedian. The great French thief, Mandrin, could not have been more irresistibly ludicrous, had he addressed the rich people whom he relieved of the burden of their property, and exhorted them henceforth to reformation, regeneration, simplicity of manners, and severity of discipline. All these loving and praiseworthy intentions, however, of M. Ricasoli were at that very time practically explained, had they needed explanation, by the suppression of convents, and confiscation of their property in the Marches and Umbria, lately added to the kingdom of Italy; and by a decree just issued which put up for sale a large amount of ecclesiastical landed property. An honest man will always prefer the *honest* theses of Wycliffe in their naked simplicity of expression.

But so far we are still witnessing a mere comic play, and we promised that it would turn out to be also a spectacular drama. By what strange incident did it become so? By a very simple one. Garibaldi, a perfect stage actor of the *spectacular* kind, had *conquered* Sicily and Naples a year or so before. Victor Emanuel, who did not disdain to become his imitator in the same noble art, was on a visit to his newly acquired possessions in the south, at the moment that M. Ricasoli was addressing the Italian Parliament in

the north, or shortly after. At Turin—for Turin was yet the capital—the great Minister of State was mimicking honesty in the manner just recorded; in Sicily and the Kingdom of Naples the noble Italian monarch was acting again to perfection the mock heroism of the "conqueror with the red shirt." Not only in his surroundings, attitude, bearing, etc., but likewise in his words, exclamations, affirmations—except perhaps the *expletives*—it was for the gaping multitude precisely what they had seen and heard from Garibaldi a year or two before. "We shall go to Rome!" "Rome must be our capital," he exclaimed on all occasions. A cool witness might have said that the King was mad. He ought to have remembered that the French troops were yet in Rome, apparently, at least, protecting the Pope. But that sensible witness would have committed a great error. The King was not mad; he was merely acting his rôle, not that of an ordinary comedian, like Ricasoli, but that of a stage hero like Garibaldi. Was it not his great mission to urge on the Italian people to speak openly their mind? Their thundering voice would be heard all over the world, and perhaps the Pope would hear it even in the Vatican.

We are not, therefore, surprised to read in the papers of the day, that "at Salerno, the *Sindaco* having offered (if you please) the city, the province, the clergy, and, as a climax, the National Guard, to aid in the triumph of Italian unity, the King accepted the offer with the warmest gratitude," and said that "he would *perhaps* soon need the fulfilment of that promise." The answer appearing still too cold to the excited *Sindaco*, "Sire," he exclaimed, with tears in his eyes, "will we go to Rome?" "Yes, we shall," replied the king, with the most solemn attitude and voice, "we shall, and soon indeed. For you it is an ardent, but yet a mere desire. I am myself under oath obliged to it." Were not these great days for the Italian play actors of high or low degree?

But it has been previously stated that on this occasion success did not crown the hope. How did it happen? Most of the events just recorded took place at the end of 1861, and in April and May, 1862. At the same epoch—we read in a French Review of that year, that it was at the very moment the Italian Parliament was discussing the tenor of the dispatches of M. La Valette—the Pope thought of inviting to Rome all the bishops of the Catholic world for a great celebration he had already had in view, namely, the canonization of some Japanese martyrs. He expected that at most a few bishops would come, the notice being so short. Three hundred had already arrived for the feast of Pentecost in June. Here it is proper to say, we are witnessing neither a comic play nor a spectacular drama, but a solemn commingling of earth with heaven, by what is called in ordinary language the communion of saints.

Not a word is uttered there of Italian questions, temporal power, popular aspirations, etc., etc.; but twenty-six names of Christian heroes who died on the cross like their Saviour, as long ago as the 5th of February, 1597, were to be added to the catalogue of saints; and the Supreme Pontiff wished to give as great a solemnity as possible to a simple religious ceremony, that had of itself no political or worldly significance.

To be sure, the Church prayed; but that is what she does all the time; only there was a more visible union between earth and heaven, and greater favors were expected from above, as is usually the case when the road is more lighted up, by which angels are wont to travel; and in fact the desired succor arrived in a way which no one would have thought likely or possible. We are writing history, but it is Christian history, into which the supernatural must necessarily enter. The state papers of the time, which must contain the notes exchanged between France and Italy, have not been open to our inspection. In Italy they have been, we are sure, kept wisely closed by Victor Emanuel ever since that epoch; and those of France open, we suppose, since the day of Sedan, have not yet been examined, so far as we know, for our present object, in the multitude of the preoccupations of France since 1870. We are, therefore, reduced to consult the sequel of events as they are recorded in ordinary papers and reviews, and here is what at once must strike the eyes of every one who does not wish to close them to the evidence of facts.

In June the great solemnity of Pentecost, just mentioned, took place in Rome, and in July everything is changed. M. Ricasoli is no more at the head of Italian affairs; Ratazzi has replaced him, and the following phrases are culled from the *Correspondant* of July, 1862: "M. Ratazzi has just taken before Europe two solemn engagements: To respect the Pope in his present frontiers, and not to suffer Lombardy insurrectionary bands to be organized against Venice." This is strange indeed. Worse still, a little further on, we read that a well-informed Russian, travelling then in Italy, Mr. Tchihatcheff, a great enemy to the spiritual power of the Pope, respectful, however, towards his temporal authority for political reasons, "asserted in a pamphlet *On the Kingdom of Italy*, that the French Emperor had stated to M. Ratazzi that 'les Italiens doivent s'arranger comme si Rome n'existait pas;' that is, must not think of making it their capital." Consequently, we are not surprised to see, further on, that "Garibaldi was furious." He went down in a rage to Sicily; the two sons of Victor Emanuel ran after him to try to bring him back to reason, but in vain, etc., etc. Two months later the popular hero was in open revolt against Victor Emanuel. Attacked by Italian troops at Aspromonte, he was

wounded, made prisoner, taken to a Piedmontese fortress by the *bersaglieri* of Cialdini, tried and convicted of rebellion by a court of assizes; and all this because he wanted that "Italy should go to Rome," as Victor Emanuel had solemnly promised. But His Majesty the King had backed down.

As the change of policy in Italy had been certainly imposed by France, there must have been a change in France also. Indeed there was: In September, M. Thouvenel was no more Minister of Foreign Affairs, nor was M. La Valette ambassador at Rome; their diplomatic notes and dispatches were "désavouées," says the *French Review.* M. de la Guéronnière, always faithful in following the inspirations of His Majesty the Emperor, had just founded a journal where he *advocated* the temporal power of the Pope; and, finally, it was agreed on all sides that the French troops would remain in Rome with the Pope, and the "Italians" would continue out of it. This was the end of the drama; but who was so far to say, *plaudite cives?* Not Victor Emanuel, certainly.

The object of the Wycliffian theses had, therefore, failed even in the nineteenth century. It was fated, however, that it should be carried out; and this happened in the second scene we have promised to describe. The first, of necessity, has detained us longer perhaps than our readers wished; the second will occupy but a moment.

The French troops were permanently withdrawn from Rome only at the outbreak of the war between France and Prussia, in August, 1870. Yet His Majesty of Piedmont did not move, and Rome remained perfectly quiet under the protection of ten or eleven thousand brave Christians, who had hastened thither at the voice of Pius IX. But as soon as the catastrophe of Sedan took place, as soon as the revolutionary government of the 4th of September broke out in a flash of tumult threatening anarchy, Victor Emanuel ordered all the forces then at his command—sixty-five thousand men—to march on Rome, and wrote a letter to the Pope dated Florence, September 8th, 1870. The first phrase only deserves to be quoted as being one of the most perfect models of hypocrisy and deceit that can be read anywhere. Since the sequel has given to the world its exact and full meaning, it ought indeed to stand on record, and be preserved to posterity. Here it is:

"Most Holy Father: With the affection of a son, with the faith of a Catholic, with the honor of a king, and with the soul of an Italian, I now, as on a previous occasion, address myself to your Holiness." The mask indeed was thick and perfect, not seedy and threadbare.

What he wished, however, was manifest enough from what followed. He proposed that his troops should be allowed to enter

the Eternal City "for the security of your Holiness and the maintenance of order." These were his words. Of course "the Head of Catholicity would be surrounded by the devotion of the Italian populations, and preserve on the banks of the Tiber a glorious See, independent of all human sovereignty."

The Pope answered this letter in a few words, full of dignity, refusing to accede to the demands of the king and adding only this short phrase, sufficient in our opinion to stop the invader in his mad career, had he not already stifled altogether the voice of his conscience: "I adore my God, who has suffered your Majesty to add to the bitterness of the latter days of my life." Then he sent his orders to Kanzler, his Minister of War, requesting him to defend the city "only sufficiently to show protest, and prove that violence was used, and no more." For once the correspondent of the London *Times* found this "a letter written in a fine Christian spirit, most dignified, and simple, and admirable in its wording."

The reader knows the rest. On the twentieth of September the papal troops, after a short resistance outside of Rome, re-entered the city. The cannon of Cadorna and Bixio made a breach in the walls; the Pope immediately ordered a white flag to be displayed, and negotiations commenced for a capitulation. The rulers of Europe had so completely separated themselves from the Head of Christendom, and so far forgotten the propriety even of offering their good offices to the fallen sovereign, that Von Arnim alone, the Prussian minister, thought proper to tender his *unofficial* intercession with the Italian commander, and thus gained an armistice of twenty-four hours to break the fury of the onset. Had not this much been done, the troops of Victor Emanuel would have at once entered Rome in the heat of the previous contest, followed by four thousand—some say ten thousand—Italian revolutionists, who accompanied the army of Cadorna, and who committed excesses enough the following day, when precautions, however, had been taken by the police, which would have been impossible on the day of the battle. None of the representatives of European sovereigns at Rome seemed to have foreseen such an eventuality as this, except the minister of bigoted Prussia. They all forgot what might have been the fate of the people, owing to their perfect indifference, if not hatred, to the Pontiff. That horrors might have been perpetrated, far worse than those which actually took place, could surely have been anticipated from the expressions used by Bixio, one of the chief commanders of the Italian armies, who, on starting for this campaign, boasted in open parliament that "he was going to throw the Pope and the cardinals into the Tiber."[1]

[1] Is it not for this reason that Bismarck is, at this moment, pursuing Von Arnim with such an unrelenting hate? If so, we would cry out: "Count Von Arnim, you

But if all the European governments were then guilty of at least the most unpardonable indifference, that of Italy, by its senseless ambition, showed itself worse than all the others. The pretext was, of course, "the unity of Italy," as if there can be unity in that country, when the Pope is not only set aside but oppressed. Will he not always have on his side a great part of the population, in fact all those in whom the religious sentiment is prevalent? How can Italy be united when her children are radically divided on so important a question? The flimsy pretext that the Pope may be deprived of his temporal power, and still govern the world, and show himself "independent of all human sovereignty," as Victor Emanuel wrote to Pius IX., cannot satisfy any rational mind; for it is an absolute impossibility. All the fine words which can be found on the subject in the "liberal" vocabulary, have really no meaning, or rather are only expressions of a deep hypocrisy. All sensible Italians, all those especially who knew the history of their country, felt it at the time, and among them particularly Cesare Balbo, who wrote in his *Pensieri* these remarkable words: Those who seek the fall of the sovereignty of the Pope are "without any understanding of the previous sufferings and experiences of Italy, deaf to its history, blind to its mission."

Meanwhile the prophecy of Wycliffe has been entirely fulfilled; the Church has been everywhere stripped of all she possessed, and for the first time in the history of the world nations have insisted on laying her bare. How did God suffer it, and not miraculously interpose in favor of "His kingdom on earth?" There cannot be any doubt that, if these pages are ever perused by men deprived of Christian sense and imbued with the Wycliffian ideas so often referred to, they may find in some of our previous reflections a subject of ridicule, and scoff at the notion that the Almighty thought proper to interpose in 1862, induced to it by the prayers of the Church on the great day of Pentecost of that year, and yet remained perfectly indifferent to the fate of his Church in 1870. We have merely related facts, which every one can interpret in his own fashion; as to the real designs of Providence, they are veiled from our eyes, and it would be presumptuous dogmatically to declare or foretell their accomplishment. Still we might insist that in the second act of the drama we have briefly described, if the Pontiff, at the end of it, became almost a prisoner in the Vatican, Napoleon III. was likewise,

---

have for you the blessing of all honest hearts in Christendom. Your *unofficial*, and consequently merely personal, interference at that moment, cannot remain without its reward. Your posterity shall be prosperous when the Lords of Varzin shall have passed away! Let your children remember that their greatness will date from the day that, at a most solemn hour of the world's history, you showed humane feelings when everybody else remained cold and indifferent. The eyes of heaven were upon you; and believe it, heaven is more powerful than any Prussian chancellor."

at that very time, a captive in Wilhelmshöhe. What will become of Victor Emanuel, the sequel will show. One thing is certain, Italy cannot be happy without a free Pope; and great disasters are surely in store for her unless she retrace some of the steps taken so violently by her. If Europe, as we shall show in a subsequent article, will never be able to settle down into a peaceful condition until she restore to Religion something of her former consideration in the eyes of the people, much more ought this to be said of Italy, which will never be able to find repose until she become again the centre and bulwark of Catholicity.

SHALL WE HAVE A UNIVERSITY?

Office and Work of Universities. By John Henry Newman. London: Pickering. 1856.

FOR many years past the question has been occasionally proposing itself to those who look in thought beyond the immediate horizon, whether the facilities afforded by our existent system of higher education be sufficient for the wants of the present age, or as a foundation for the probable needs of the future. It is doubted by discerning men whether that can be called a system which has so little uniformity and such radical divergencies; and it is plainly asked whether we have shown educationally the same breadth and depth of view for the advanced instruction of our posterity, that we are admitted to have displayed politically, in laying broad and deep the foundations of a government such as the world has never before seen? Nor has the answer been such as to satisfy those who hold, we believe justly, that each generation of mankind owes, as a duty to the succeeding one, that, during its occupancy of earth, attention to the spiritual and mental wants of the world shall at least keep pace with improvement in ways and means of material advancement and physical welfare. Have we then, in this country, devoted a tithe of the means, time, or talent to the examination and fostering of possible or actual means of high intellectual progression, that we have applied to the development of machinery, or to material inventive discovery? We conceive that, while we shall be found to have made larger progress in the latter than we have any record of, in the same space of time in the history of the world, it will be also apparent that this has taken place at the expense of the appliances for higher education. There is no question about the fact that a large amount of infor-

mation has been diffused among the masses of the people; and it is admitted, on all hands, that a different kind of specific education, whether in the higher or lower forms of mental acquirement, is rendered more or less imperative by the peculiarities of each revolving age. But it must be granted that our universities and colleges (we have the names, if we have not what they should represent) are certainly not advancing with the requirements of the age; nay, there are many sedate thinkers and conscientious men, who find themselves obliged to admit that these institutions, instead of advancing, are retrograding; who see in the continuance of the present evasive substitutes under high-sounding names, no possibility of improvement, but rather the germs of constant and still more rapid deterioration. Our young men who have acquired all that these institutions have to impart, are by no means so well stored intellectually, either with actual knowledge, dialectic skill in the use of what they have, or practical information, as was the case in former times; and who will say that they (the graduates of to-day) are as well ballasted morally with steadfast principles as were their predecessors of half a century ago? Now, so far is this from being what our country has a right to demand of us, that it shows us palpably delinquent in duty to our own age, to say nothing of the rights of posterity. So far, what has been said refers educationally to the whole of our common country, without allusion to any distinction of creed.

But we Catholics contend, contrary to the opinions of most of our fellow-countrymen, that education, purely secular and mental, whether in the elementary, higher, or in the highest branches, is, if dissociated from religious training, an injury rather than a benefit; and we insist that the two things must be carried on simultaneously, from the first initiation into the alphabet to the highest point that education can attain. Hence it is that Catholics, while obliged by law to pay for the support of schools which they cannot in conscience patronize, tax themselves still more lavishly for the support of their own parochial schools, in which the claims of God and religion are not ignored; in which the child, at the same time that he learns to read, write, etc., acquires also his prayers, is instructed in the creed, the commands of God and of his Church, and gains a system of practical morals. Pains also are taken, and large expense incurred, to render the grade and amount of instruction imparted in these schools as high and complete as possible; and there is great reason to believe that their effect has already been to check, in great measure, the former yearly loss to the Church of many children of Catholic emigrants, too many of whom fell away from all religion, as a result of the training of the "*common schools.*" It would, however, not be fair to allow an inference

to be drawn from what has been said, that no efforts have been made by Catholics to accomplish a similar result in the higher walks of education. In fact, we can point with pride and entire confidence to our schools and academies for the higher education of females, which abound in every portion of the United States. These are almost invariably under the charge of one or other of the female teaching Orders of the Church; and we neither know personally, nor have we heard from others, any reason to impugn their thorough competency, or their success in the task they have undertaken.

Within the United States there had been already established up to 1875, seventy-four *colleges*, distinctively Catholic, chartered and conferring degrees. There is not *to-day*, in the entire country, a single institution, Catholic, Protestant (of any shade), or non-descript, entitled to the name of *university* in the European sense of the word. Indeed, in common parlance, as well as in more pretentious literary usage, there is no distinction made in the use of the two terms; while there are some institutions to which the term *university* is applied as their *legal* title, though no difference whatever exists between the work accomplished in them, and that done in any of their fellow-establishments, under the designation of *colleges*. The *colleges* of France, of which there are some 320, do not come here into question at all, since they are, *plus minusve*, exactly what the *gymnasien* are in Germany, and are all controlled by the University of France. Strictly speaking, a *college*, in the academic sense, should be an institution for imparting the highest grade of instruction in letters and sciences, endowed with revenues, chartered by the State, and subject to a private or special code of laws. A university, in like manner, is properly an institution of learning, in which the whole round of letters, arts, and sciences (*universitas scientiarum*) is taught by special professors for each branch; which confers degrees in each or all, in which (besides the academic studies) law, medicine, and theology are taught by their respective faculties, and which may consist of an agglomeration of colleges, as in England, or of a sole corporation, as is usually the case on the continent of Europe. Some of our older and more flourishing colleges have faculties and impart instruction in law, medicine, or divinity, and, in a very few instances, in all the professional studies; while again, most of the establishments legally entitled universities, either impart no such instruction, or, it may be, only in one branch. Apart from the before-mentioned seventy-four Catholic colleges, there are in the United States nearly six hundred other colleges, almost all under the auspices and direct control of one or other of the various Protestant sects; for, while the theoretic cry is that there shall be "*no sectarianism*," the mani-

fest design is that each denomination shall disseminate by all means in its power its own doctrines; and the actual practice is, in both the lowest and highest grades of schools, that the views of religion entertained by the teacher, are always more or less strictly inculcated upon the student. Now our country is the paradise of the sects; no other under the sun has so many of them; and as their leaders see the hold, which control, more especially of the higher education, of students gives them, the advantages of authorized access to the mind of the boy at that stage of his progress, when, with a certain strength of mind and some literary culture, he is forming his views of religion and morals, it will be readily seen that the sectarians are right, each from his own standpoint, in trying to secure such vantage-ground by the establishment of academies, colleges, etc. But the effect on these institutions themselves is, as might be expected, clearly belittling; and, as a result, said colleges, so numerous, so scantily endowed (when endowed at all), competing with one another for students, like so many life insurance companies, cannot, for the most part, pay competent men as professors, can hold forth no inducement to suitable persons to prepare themselves for such positions, have neither adequate library nor apparatus, and find themselves lacking in or entirely destitute of the spirit with which fame, success, or correspondent reward inspires teachers; and likewise lacking in numbers, skilled instruction, proper appliances, and the resultant emulation which animate and encourage students. "*Sublatis studiorum præmiis, etiam studia ipsa cito peritura.*" The professor having gotten a position, the continuance in which does not involve his devoting himself to further study, degenerates into the *iteratorum reiterator*, the retailer year by year of his first year's platitudes. The students feel no interest in his lectures or explications. The mediocre student is simply anxious to get his degree and leave the place; while the bright scholar (or he who might have become so under an able and advancing professor), comes mentally to the conclusion that if such be the results of learning (and this is his *beau ideal* of the article in question), the advantages of literature are very slight. The country swarms with professors and institutions moping and drowsing along just in this way.

Far be it from us to give wilful offence or to speak harshly; nor do we imagine that the open statement of what *many* reflecting men have said, and *all*, whose attention has been called to the subject, must have thought—a truth to which we need not longer close our eyes—can be, in any fair sense, considered a cause of umbrage. We mean, then, to say that we Catholics, through the natural effects of example and proximity, have become, in this respect, infected slightly by Protestant influence, tarred a little with the stick of the

sectaries. Whether we have not been insensibly led to imitate them in other minor habits and practices, is not the question before us; but that we have followed their lead in this matter of multiplying small, feeble, helpless institutions, magniloquently calling them colleges, conferring degrees in course and honorary by means of their charters, and in all respects enacting annual solemn farces at their *commencements*, is too patent a fact to be denied. The mistake that has been made originated in right motives and in necessity; but it has degenerated into an abuse, and an abuse is frequently separated by very narrow boundaries from a moral wrong. In the early and feeble days of the Church in the United States, when Catholics were few, poor, and scattered, it was very natural that the faithful, feeling, as in accordance with their belief they must have felt, so much more strongly than their neighbors, the truth of their doctrines and the necessity of transmitting unimpaired to their posterity the sacred deposit of the faith, should have established, as well as their poverty would permit them, several colleges or high schools. When we consider, too, within what a short time the Church has made her most rapid advance in this country, we have great reason to congratulate ourselves that by means of these and other similar institutions, so much has been accomplished in the direction of the higher education. But now that we have taken form and consistency, it behooves us to manifest that we are in earnest in our zeal, not merely for education in its lower grades, but for the most thorough and most abstruse that the conditions of the age and of the Church with regard to the age render necessary; and to do this we must plainly consolidate our educational forces so far as the higher mental culture is concerned. We have gotten too much into the habit of sending educationally "*a boy to do a man's errand.*" We should have ceased adding to the small fry of colleges, at least with the introduction of railroads, consentaneous with which as to time has been our most solid increase. From that time on, the reasons that excused or palliated, in the first instances, the establishment and maintenance of ineffective colleges ceased to exist; and the same energy on the part of their founders, the same means and patronage on the part of the Catholic public that sufficed to support or to keep in existence ten such schools, would have made any one of them an institution of learning worthy of the name, an establishment of which Catholics might well be proud, a foundation for the not yet needed, but even then grandly looming up *Catholic University of the United States.* Instead of this, we see the patronage of the Catholic portion of the community frittered away among seventy-four colleges, until it just suffices to keep most of them from absolute inanition; and the eight or ten that are beyond that stage are neither doing what their managers

would like, nor what they would, under more favorable circumstances, have been abundantly able to perform for the credit of Catholics and for the benefit of religion. Except in the single matter of classics, our colleges have consequently been very little, if at all, superior in a literary point of view to the non-Catholic establishments about them. Their poverty necessitated, perhaps, though it never could render thoroughly consistent with right reason, the habitual employment of the *seminarian* or *scholastic* element in teaching; since that must, in each case, have been always an experiment—not always a successful one—and the "*fiat experimentum in corpore vili*" could hardly have been satisfactory to intelligent patrons, however much it might adapt itself to the debility and poverty of the different colleges that pursued the plan. In short, they have competed with and stood in the way of each other until, advance being impossible, they tried to remain stationary; but as such a condition is not realizable, whether for individual or institution, few have made much advance, and the largest number have for years been quietly retrograding. This disease, certainly, we must have caught from the sectaries. Our ancestors did not know the disorder, and our fellow-Catholics the world over have never yet been attacked by it. It is an epidemic against which stringent sanitary measures are necessary, and we know of none likely to prove so efficacious in preventing the pest for the future, in spurring to greater usefulness on a higher plan, and, it may be, in weeding out members found *minus habentes*, than that to which the common consent of many Catholic thinkers on the subject points, viz., the establishment of a Catholic university nearly on the plan *mutatis mutandis* of the universities of Prague or Vienna, with an infusion of some features of Göttingen, Padua, and Bologna. It is proposed to treat of this subject in the following order, viz.: (1.) The necessity for such an institution in the United States. (2.) Its feasibility. (3.) Some details of a project for the establishment. (4.) Its professorships. (5.) Its students. (6.) Beneficial results to the Church and to our country.

That there may be no misunderstanding, let it be premised that what it is proposed to write is conceived in no captious or carping spirit. Indeed, there is small reason for fault-finding, when with comparatively limited means, and under such discouraging circumstances—our greatest increase having been synchronous with the days of Native Americanism, Know-nothingism, the wide extension of secret societies, and the lamentable civil war—so much at least was effected in the direction of the higher education by some of the older colleges, while none were inferior, in any respect, scientifically, to their numerous and supercilious neighbors. We repeat our previous assertion, that the study of classics has, in our Catholic

colleges, always stood on a higher plane, been pursued more thoroughly, and to a greater extent, than in the sectarian institutions under the same name. All honor to the sons of Loyola, who established the college of Georgetown! Who can forget the noble legacy left the Church by Fathers Dubois and Bruté, in the founding of Mount St. Mary's? We are sincerely thankful for the amount of good accomplished by the other numerous seminaries of learning, commenced at various times all over our broad country, and we are far from saying that their day of usefulness is past. But altered circumstances require altered plans, and in suggesting (we trust in demonstrating) the necessity, not of their abolition, but of their existence under a changed form, and one calculated to do a great deal more good, we are only seconding the views which their founders, were they alive, would express; and certainly we are only actuated, if we know ourselves, by an ardent desire to promote the best interests of the Church, the advancement of which has been, at all times, the prime reason for the existence of educational institutes. But concentration of mind is no more necessary in study than is concentration of means, appliances, and numbers, constant contact of mind with mind, and of differently constituted minds with each other in the entire process, but especially in the highest phases of education. The apothegm, "*divide et impera*," is much more widely applicable than its originator had in mind when he first uttered it. Furthermore, while the writer has, of course, his plan to suggest, and asks a hearing for it, believing it to be a good one, yet he has lived too long to fancy that he has any monopoly of wisdom or practical sense of fitness, and he stands ready to be corrected on any point in his facts, reasonings, or suggestions, strong only in the one position, that he does not conceive it possible that any unprejudiced man should fail to see the injury daily inflicted on the sublime cause of higher education by the multiplication of puny, though certainly well-intended, institutions designed for its extension. It would be the height of vanity to expect to do more by means of this article than to suggest ideas and plans, and to elicit the like from others, so that—should the Catholics of the United States, after a fair and full survey of the ground and of the reasons *pro et contra*, come to the conclusion that the time has arrived for the establishment of a "National University"—the beginnings may be made after the most complete interchange of view and plan, experience and probability. It is not a work into which, in any case, we should dash at haphazard. The importance of it, not merely to ourselves and our own age, but to generations yet unborn, is too great; nor are the ideas on the subject of any one man, however able naturally, or cultivated by education, certain to be found such as would work thoroughly in practice. We, therefore, cordially invite both

friendly and adverse criticism—prepared to answer either until either shall convince ourselves.

1. Possibly some of our readers may not be aware of, or may not realize, the rapid increase of the Church in the United States, in means and numbers, within the last forty years; an increase out of all proportion greater than that of the country in general, in population and wealth, during the same period. Now, numbers and wealth mean, in all countries, power; and in none is this more emphatically the case than in the United States. Whether the power shall be inert and ineffective, or active and efficient, will depend entirely on the intellectual culture of the possessors. Those who wish to bring the stupendous facts vividly and connectedly before their minds, will be able to form an accurate idea of the changes that have taken place, by comparing the *Catholic Almanac* for 1836 with the *Catholic Directory* for 1876. We shall give but a general conception of the facts, when we state that in the former year, in which Dr. Dubois was consecrated Bishop of New York (at that time including the whole State, together with the greater part of New Jersey), his whole diocese contained but 150,000 Catholics; of whom there were in the city alone 35,000. Fourteen years before (1822), Dr. Connolly counted in the same diocese but eight priests. Now the same territory has been divided into seven dioceses, the smallest of which contains a larger Catholic population than did the entire diocese at the accession of Bishop Dubois; and the archdiocese (which now includes little more than the city and county of New York) contains a Catholic population of 650,000. Churches, colleges, seminaries, schools, select and parochial, asylums, protectories for boys and girls, hospitals, homes for aged men and women, male and female religious communities, exist in large numbers, and the same territory, which in 1836 contained but 150,000, now counts upwards of 1,500,000 Catholics. The same thing has been going on all over the country; and though the numbers to be mentioned in connection with the increase in other parts of the country may not be so large, yet it will be found, on investigation, that the proportion of increase, both to our own numbers at the time, and to the non-Catholic population, is, in many cases, much greater, and in all is calculated to astonish the foreigner, the Protestant, or even the American Catholic whose attention has not been previously called to the fact. From less than half a million in 1836, we now number more than 6,000,000 in the United States. Nor is there any reason to suppose that our future advance will be less rapid or less solid; since, indeed, the progress made within the aforesaid forty years has been made in the teeth of poverty within, flouts and jeers from without, intense sectarian hatred, virulent opposition on the part of the oath-bound secret societies (many of them gotten up *ex-professo*,

and all of them wielding their influence *de facto*, against the Church), to say nothing of the rancorous political hostility displayed by the outbreak of the so-called Native Americans in 1844, and of the Know-nothings in 1856.

With such numbers, then, and a fair prospect of such increase in the near future, it is most manifestly our duty to do for higher culture, what we have been doing so well for elementary, secondary, and grammar school instruction. There is now hardly to be found in the United States a church, in any of our cities or towns, that has not its parochial school, in which the children receive that instruction which we consider absolutely essential to make of them true Catholic men and women ; and the number of Catholic academies and high schools spread broadcast over the land is, at least, adequate to our present needs, and capable, without much change of system,—by mere multiplication of numbers,—of supplying the demands of any probable or possible increase of Catholicity.

But the same cannot with truth be said of the education, which, in this country, goes under the name of collegiate, and which has been and continues to be our highest form of academic culture. Here we fail, and not we alone, but the collegiate system itself is on a false basis throughout the United States. In the case of Catholics, the lack arises from the fact that in the infancy and helplessness (humanly speaking) of Catholicity in this country, the game was in the hands of our opponents, and there was nothing for us to do but follow their lead. Every sect, of course, founded, according to its numbers, zeal and means, one or more colleges. Our people, most of them emigrants, long used to living as it were on sufferance, and accustomed to persecution, were disposed to make as little demonstration, to give as little offence, as possible. It was clear that some provision must be made for higher education. As Catholics, they could not conscientiously send their young men to colleges where the instruction was in Protestant, and, therefore, hostile hands. Travel was in those days slow, difficult, dangerous, expensive, and the settlements at points very remote from each other. They themselves were in most instances very poor—in few cases comfortably situated as to means—while the wealthy among them were very rare indeed. These were the days when Bishop Connolly declared in a letter to the Propaganda, that "*the American youth have an almost invincible repugnance to the ecclesiastical state.*" Hence there were established, of necessity, in many parts of the United States, institutions of learning, called colleges, sometimes by secular clergymen, sometimes by regulars, which did the best that could, at the time and under the circumstances, be done, and which accomplished and continue to perform good work, for which they deserve all credit. But it was never proposed that these institutions should supply the lack of a

university—still less that their various *curricula* should be, for all future time, deemed the acme of academic instruction in our country. The strong probability is, that it never entered into the imagination of the most sanguine of the founders of those earliest schools that an institution such as we now propose, would be, for 150 years yet to come, imperatively demanded by the spread of the Church.

Here it becomes necessary to glance at the advantages of university education, as contrasted with collegiate, in the formation of character, imparting of knowledge, and preparation of the student for life. Of course, school, academy, college, and university are all but preparatory steps for the active duties of the lawyer, physician, theologian, professor, scientific or literary man; as indeed our entire life is only a state of probation for a better. Now, to Catholics it is unnecessary to say that it is a most calamitous fallacy to suppose that there can be any genuine intellectual culture in the mere acquisition of secular knowledge; and indeed Protestants themselves do not admit the principle in its naked deformity (save where it is necessary to hold it forward as a buffer to Catholic arguments against the present management of the public schools). We are, as Catholics, all agreed that in every course of study intended to benefit either the individual or the race, religion and morals must be constantly inculcated, explained, and discussed from every point of view: not merely tagged on, like the grace at an alderman's dinner, or a perfunctory congressional prayer. We desire our students at least to be Christians, and we consider their time, wheresoever spent, as worse than lost, and their attainments, how lofty soever, as worse than useless, unless they shall therewith have acquired that fear of the Lord which is the beginning of wisdom. Having never had in this country any exemplification of the working of a university system, many very well-read persons amongst us have but a vague idea of its effects upon students; but we think that the great points that contradistinguish the two systems (those, namely, of the *college* and *university*), are the extent and thoroughness of the latter as compared with the former—the greater variety of studies, the higher standard of attainment, the more frequent and rigorous examinations, the greater number and skill of professors, the greater completeness of library, philosophical and chemical appliances, to say nothing of the appurtenances in astronomy and other studies, by which they can be acquired not merely theoretically but practically. But there is another and a more important point than any or all of these, in which the university must far outstrip the college, and in saying this we do not in the least undervalue any of the distinctive special advantages claimed above. The idea will be more readily conceived by adverting to the fact, that even in our colleges, imperfect as they are, it would be by no means

true to say that all the education there acquired is imparted to the student by the professor and in the class-room. We all know that there is pervading each of them, just in proportion as it approaches to deserving the name, a sort of subtle influence and tone of thought, a quasi *genius loci*, that stamps the student quite as unmistakably as do the actual acquirements, literary or scientific, which are the results of his class attendance. Now, if this be the case at our colleges to which students resort in comparatively small numbers, and at all stages of preparation—frequently with very little—where professors are not invariably either energetic or able, and where (should a given professor be both, he is obliged to adapt his instruction to some mediocre standard) the curriculum is scant, and that little often curtailed for any of the various reasons that will readily recur to the mind of any one who has either taught or studied in them; how much more of such insensible, but none the less actual, education will there not be constantly going on at our proposed Catholic university, where lectures will be given, always by able and enthusiastic professors, on every subject in the range of knowledge to large numbers of well-prepared students; where combined efforts for investigating truth will be constantly put forth by youthful spirits eager to attain it; where intellectual culture will find in the free intercourse of mind with mind, and in the salutary collision of taste, feeling, and opinion its most invaluable instrument? Given the competent professors and the students, previously so drilled in their studies as to be thoroughly adequate to the work before them, there will soon establish itself, as inseparable from the place, a recognized standard, both of Catholic thought and practice, to have been subject to which would in itself be a *liberal education*, and one infinitely more important than that other culture (momentous though it be), to attain which was the prime object in matriculating. It may be laid down as admitted, that the objects of our higher education are twofold, viz., adequate intellectual culture and adequate doctrinal knowledge: synchronous in point of acquisition, the moral and religious portion of which is not merely to be apprehended by the intellect, but to be brought home, as it were, fully to the moral nature, that they may become the motive power of future social and political action. For, though we be numerous in this country, and faithful, the devil has not yet been chained; our adversaries are keen, some of them able, all bitter, and most of them unscrupulous. We must be prepared for them, and to be properly prepared we need champions who can confront their false morals, impious doctrines, and infidel politics, with both head and heart; the ability of the former being but a poor reliance without the steadfast adherence of the latter. Indeed it is not merely for aggression upon or defence against those without the pale of the

Church, that we need such ability and loyalty on the part of the watchmen on the walls of Sion, but in our country the very atmosphere seems to hold in solution poisons deadly to Catholic instincts. On one side a non-Catholic or an anti-Catholic press, on another the sectaries banded together against us; here the oath-bound societies, yonder the infidels, by whatever name they may be known; all taint the air with their venom; the breath we inhale is surcharged with it. It becomes at times visible to the ordinary mental discernment, as does to the corporeal eye the fine dust in the air of a closed room, when, on opening a shutter, we see the motes in the sunbeam; and our standard-bearers, the clergy, as well as our laymen who meet this subtly permeating influence in the daily walks of life, need all the intellectual culture and spiritual graces possible, that they may withstand in their own persons, and successfully combat in the case of others, these malignant and too often maleficent agencies.

Most of our readers have at some time attended a concert, or other entertainment, where the audience was small, the performers depressed, enthusiasm impossible, however thorough the display of ability, and do they not know the effects upon themselves? Had the same performance been presented before an overflowing house, with the *elan* that full sympathy, complete *rapport* with a large audience is sure to impart, how differently would it not have been received, how much more thrillingly would not the audience have been affected, leaving after it a memory that should quit the mind but with life. This gives us an approximate, though but a faint, idea of the far superior and more lasting influence exercised by university instruction as compared with our present mode of collegiate teaching, both as to the unseen daily and hourly effect and the visible stamp impressed on the intellectual and æsthetic, the moral and religious nature of students and professors. Why, the twin English universities, bad as they are, and much as we object to them (we need not undertake to prove to Catholics with how much reason) have been the prime, the controlling, the moving cause of England's political greatness. Hear Doctor Newman. We want no better Catholic authority on this subject, nor would it be possible to find one whose whole career enables him to understand the subject so thoroughly. He says:

"What would come, on the other hand, of the ideal systems of education that have fascinated the imagination of the age, could they ever take effect, and whether they would not produce a generation frivolous, narrow-minded, and resourceless, intellectually considered, is a fair subject for debate; but so far it is certain, that the universities to which I refer, and which did little more than bring together first boys and then youths in large numbers, these

institutions, with miserable deformities on the side of morals, with a hollow profession of Christianity and a heathen code of ethics,—I say, at least they can boast of a succession of heroes and statesmen, of literary men and philosophers, of men conspicuous for great national virtues, for habits of business, for knowledge of life, for practical judgment, for cultivated tastes, and for accomplishments, who have made England what it is,—able to subdue the earth,—able to domineer over Catholics." (*Idea of a University.*)

In fact this branch of the subject,—the necessity for university instruction and its superior effectiveness,—is so thoroughly and exhaustively treated by F. Newman, that we cannot do better than refer those who desire full satisfaction on that score, to the work above quoted. We shall thus, at once, avoid traversing ground already thoroughly surveyed, and leave space for other and important matter, in part peculiar to us of the United States, pertaining to the matter in hand.

Here in our own country the bishops of the Church assembled in council in 1866, have declared, and put on record in the *Acta et Decreta Conc. Plen. Balt. II*, their judgment of the desirableness and ultimate necessity of such an institution of higher learning, though they did not *then* think the time fully arrived for its establishment. Their words are:

"Atque utinam in hac regione, collegium unum maximum sive Universitatem habere liceret, quod collegiorum horum omnium, sive domesticorum, sive exterorum, commoda atque utilitates complecteretur; in quo, sc. literæ ac scientiæ omnes, tam sacræ quam profanæ, traderentur! Utrum vero Universitatis hujusmodi constituendæ tempus advenerit, necne, Patrum judicio, rem totam maturius posthac perpendentibus, relinquimus."

These *Acta et Decreta* were approved by the Holy Father, as appears by the letter of Cardinal Barnabo, published therewith. The Pontiffs indeed have, at all times, been the promoters of the higher or university education, and during the temporal power of the Papacy, the most munificent supporters of universities, both in form of endowment, and privileges; nor has it ever been, as is often falsely alleged, either the policy or practice of the Church to repress learning, as all history sufficiently evinces; neither do we believe that those who make the assertion, themselves give credence to it for a moment. They simply use a cry which they find popular and effective wherever ignorance and prejudice are combined against the Church. What care they for the fact that nearly all the oldest universities of Europe (in fact *all* save the few that grew up of themselves), were either founded or fostered by the Popes of Rome, who moreover exercised the right of superintending them, a fact which may be historically verified in the cases

of the universities of Bologna and Paris, which dispute the palm of antiquity with each other? Innocent IV. decreed that no sentence of excommunication, suspension, or interdict against the latter university, or any of its members, should have effect without special license of the Apostolic See, and countless privileges have been conferred on such institutions by pontiffs before and since. Now dynasties die out, and governments change; revolutions are constantly taking place, not without detriment ofttimes to the establishments endowed by the pious of past ages, for the cause of religion, education, or philanthropy. The Church alone of all institutions remains permanent and steadfast. In triumph or persecution, in wealth or poverty, numerically large or gathered together by twos and by threes, she remains always the same, and the Almighty has promised that she shall not fail. Now though God has wrought by miracles,—does so work still when it pleases him, —and may do so at any time, for "*his hand is not shortened*," yet he usually operates by his general laws, and requires of us for our own good, to co-operate in his working, for the benefit of the race. "God helps those who help themselves," is true in the material and intellectual order, nor is it false in the religious. The Church will always need her intellectual champions till the end of time, and while Almighty God can supply them, as he did on the day of Pentecost, yet, in no age of the history of the Church have her members deemed it right to rely solely on such miraculous interference and assistance; but they have, in every country of Christendom, established, in view of her need of trained defenders, such institutions as that for the necessity of which in this country we are now suggesting reasons, and that is the university system, the most perfect, namely, that the best intellects and accumulated experience of ancient and modern times have been able to devise, for securing the aims of a thorough education, viz., complete intellectual and thorough religious culture.

We submit, then, that the point of the necessity for a Catholic university in the United States, is established (1), on the ground of our present numbers and probable increase, (2), because it is as much (if not more manifestly) our duty to provide for the highest as it is for elementary education; (3), because thereby we check that loss to the Church, and gain to the ranks of infidelity, which the want of sound scientific instruction, and the plausibility of pretentious scientists, has occasioned and still causes; (4), because with no higher culture than that afforded by our present scattered, imperfect, superficial, and needy colleges, we cannot fit out young men to withstand at all points the attacks of Buckle, Huxley, Darwin, Mill, etc.; (5), because our students need the stimulus, and our professors the impetus, of the university system; (6), because

such system is the best that the wit of man has ever devised; (7), because its existence and influence would largely diminish and finally root out that sciolism and pretence which are our educational bane; (8), because said establishment has been solemnly recommended by the bishops of our country, and approved by the Holy See; and finally (9), because Almighty God works by means, and we are bound to do our part in employing the best means for the preservation and extension of the faith.

2. We come next to the feasibility of the establishment and maintenance of such a university in the United States. This question evidently resolves itself into three prominent points of inquiry, viz.: 1. Can the pecuniary means be secured? 2. Can thoroughly competent professors be obtained? 3. Will there be found thoroughly prepared students, in sufficient numbers to justify the establishment? Of course, this, like every other movement in advance, will meet with opposition; some of which will doubtless arise from that class, so numerous everywhere, whose constant cry is "*quieta non movere*," and they translate it into "let well enough alone;" more from some misjudging persons, connected with the existing colleges, who will be apt to fancy that the university is likely to curtail the dignity or interfere with the revenues of their respective colleges; and probably, most of all, will signal opposition arise from our young men, who, imbued, as they are, with our peculiarly American idea of launching out into the various professions at the earliest possible age, and (we must add) with very inadequate qualifications, will have the strongest possible objection to a plan which will necessitate several additional years of study before taking even an academic degree; and which will, at every point in the literary course, require thorough examination before the student can pass higher. But, as we have not the remotest doubt but that the university, once established, will soon commend itself, we lay but little stress upon the factious temporary opposition that may arise. Stage-drivers, wayside landlords, and canal boatmen bitterly opposed the locomotive, and had "reasons plenty as blackberries." The old-time naval officers never have become reconciled to the use of war steamers; and, doubtless, the scriveners and copyists of old raised a howl on the introduction of types; but railroads, steam-vessels, and printing carried the day in the end.

Whether, then, the pecuniary means necessary for the purpose can be secured, will depend entirely upon the continued existence of that faith and benevolence among Catholics, for which they have been in all ages and countries remarkable, and of the failure of which from their midst, in this country, and at this day, we have neither any information nor reason to imagine that such is the fact. In days long past, Oxford, Cambridge, Bologna, Paris, Ingolstad,

Tübingen, Salamanca, Alcalà, Coimbra, Padua, Prague, and Vienna, with numerous others, were founded by Catholics, who devoted to the endowment of professorships, means, the income from which, is (save in the first two) to this day devoted to the objects intended by the founders, and the holy sacrifice statedly offered up for their pious intentions. Holy pontiffs approved, fostered, and cherished them. The numbers of students in attendance on the lectures delivered at these institutions during the middle ages, would seem to us incredible, were the facts not so well attested. In 1453, the number of students at the University of Paris amounted to 25,000; and Joseph Scaliger assures us that when he studied there, it had reached 30,000. It will be readily admitted that in none of the countries where these noble institutions were established, were the needs any greater than in our own country and now; and *we* need not certainly (our numbers being taken into consideration) fear comparison with the nations of those days in any of the Christian virtues. In our own time, and in Ireland (one of the poorest countries of Europe), a Catholic university has been established; and it is but a short time since we of the United States founded and endowed the "American College" at Rome; doubt alone as to what the Italian government might do, and distrust of that *re galantuomo*, preventing the endowment from being a magnificent one. The monuments of Catholic charity and piety meet us on every hand, and why should we believe that so noble an object, as this at which we aim, will fall to the ground for lack of the means requisite to set it on a firm foundation? Nay, we doubt not but there would be, in the course of time, an eagerness on the part of Catholics, lay and ecclesiastic, to found courses of lectures and professorships in such a university, just as in the old Catholic times, when so many such were instituted in the European universities. The obligation of a stated mass, certain prayers, or other devotions, for the intention of the donor, might be conjoined therewith; the professorship, or course of lectures, might be distinguished by the name of the founder or benefactor; and yearly the students and professors on that foundation should assemble in the church to pray devoutly for the repose of the soul of the founder. We can, from a Catholic point of view, imagine no better use to which those Catholics could apply their means, who, having been blessed in life by the acquisition of property, find themselves at life's close either without relatives or without such as stand in need; nor do we think that we differ in view from the mass of Catholics on this point. But the benefits, necessity, and workings of such an institution must firstly be explained, so that Catholics shall understand them; a beginning will need to be made that we may have something tangible to show; the management must be confided to men

both able and beyond suspicion in the community; it must, from the beginning and always, have no taint of *coterie*, still less of ring rule or family influence about it; so far, in short, as anything human can be faultless in management, this university must be so; and just in proportion as it fails in this, in just the same ratio will it fall short of the aims to attain which we urge its establishment. Great care must be exercised in the formation of its charter, and thorough provision made therein for its stability and permanence. Observe well, that it is not contended that such an institution can attain its ultimate perfection in a year, or, it may be, fifty years. It will, in large part, be an accretion requiring time for its shaping and consolidation. It cannot be expected to spring like Minerva from the brain of Jupiter, fully armed, and equipped cap-à-pie. No similar establishment has ever done so, but afitting nucleus can be constituted capable of indefinite extension; additions can be made, as piety, public spirit, and its own growth furnish the means and material, with and upon which to work. The work before it can, from the beginning, be *well* done; every year will add to its completeness and bring it nearer to perfection; and the community, having then the means of comparison, will not be slow, even in matters of technical, scientific, academic, and moral education, to discern the difference between work slurred, and work thoroughly well done. The thorough certitude having once taken hold of the Catholic public, that the institution is permanently established and thoroughly performing its mission, there will, we venture to predict, be no further difficulty about means, unless indeed it be to prevent their accumulation to such an extent that *mole ruat sua;* a calamity against which also due precautions should be taken in the university charter and code of laws. We ourselves know personally of several instances in which anxious inquiries have been made by Catholics, within a few years past, for just such an opportunity of bestowing their means during life, or posthumously; and we are fully assured that we have heard of but a minute fractional percentage of the similar cases that have occurred and are daily occurring throughout the country. And why not? In proportion to our means, we of this republic have done (we will not say *more*, but certainly in a pecuniary point of view) as much for the initiation and furthering of everything that appealed to us as likely to benefit the Church, as the Catholics of any foreign nation; and we are loath to believe that the work of establishing a university, for the attainment of the highest possible degree of intellectual culture combined with the most thorough Catholic moral and religious instruction, would prove an exception.

As to the professors, with whom we shall begin the institution, there are several points to be taken into consideration. Men *fairly*

capable in most of the different branches are to be found with comparative ease. In still larger numbers are to be found men who talk fluently on almost any subject you may start, who have passed at some college, know some Latin and Greek, possibly a modicum of Hebrew and Sanscrit, who have a general inkling of mathematics, possess fair *ad populum* notions of mental and moral philosophy, and would not like to hear their knowledge of history called in question. They have read natural philosophy, and forgotten all but its salient features; of chemistry they retain, perhaps, the symbols for ox., hyd., and nit. They have read in reviews about the Aryan tongues and the Turanian languages; know in general that there are such books as the maxims of Menu, the Maha-bharata, the Zend-Avesta; are heavily freighted with dubious information about the various westward emigrations from Asia, from the Celtic down to the last Tartaric; entertain vague notions about geology, and have a cursory acquaintance with French and German. The former class, for the most part, consist of men who would be the first to recognize their want of fitness, if not of ability, for professorships in such an institution as is proposed, being long occupied in some fixed profession, with habits of life formed in consonance therewith, usually advanced in years, and who for all these reasons would be either unwilling or confessedly unable to do justice to the duties of the position. Such men would themselves see, at a glance, that for such an undertaking it is not *fairly* and *tolerably*, but *thoroughly* and *completely* capable men that are needed, men *qui ad unguem callent*, and who are enthusiastically devoted to a single branch of science or literature, *i. e.*, to that single study with its essential cognates and agnates. We do not want, as professor of Greek, for example, the man who knows Greek about as well as he knows astronomy, and has as much interest in Kant's *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* as in either. For, the kind and quantum of knowledge that will be highly creditable to a student on examination for his degree, and which will very properly procure him a diploma, will not suffice in the professor who stands up before the world as master of a given branch. None of our professors can, to use a homely expression, be "jack of all trades," lest perchance the latter clause of the saying might be found equally applicable. The "*foible of omniscience*" ought to be stamped out in the subordinate institutions, and must never be allowed to enter at the university. Even the student has of necessity one favorite study, always more in accordance with his taste than any of the others; and how much more must not this be the case with the professor, whose absolute and voluntarily undertaken duty it is to be fully posted on his specialty, and to keep himself *au courant* of all information on his branch. "*Nemo potest duobus servire magistris*" emanates from the highest authority, and is

nowhere more pointedly applicable than here. The professor must be one who has thoroughly devoted himself to his specific study, so as to bring his acquaintance with it, in all its bearings, as near perfection as possible; one who is fond of teaching, apt at it, not maundering or discursive, but clear, concise, incisive, and able to render his subject interesting. To be any or all of these he must know his branch thoroughly, and must be at the same time a constant investigator. He must be a student himself while he teaches others, not in the sense in which the student teacher keeps a few pages in advance of the other scholars, whom he is wrong-headedly set to instruct, or, as he who can scarcely make out Juvenal, is set to ground a class in Eutropius. What is meant is that, in addition to constant study, or reading (if you like the word better), of the standard works on his particular subject, he should cultivate a close acquaintance with everything appearing, from month to month, from other professors of the same branch in Europe and America. The *passable* scholar, then, the merely *tolerable* professor, will not answer our purpose; and if we can do no better than appoint him, it is quite useless for us to put ourselves to any pains in establishing our university; since we shall have, save in the matter of numbers and the insensible education acquired by young men thus brought together in pursuit of knowledge, gained no advantage over the present system. Indeed, the wise selection of able and judicious professors, and their diligent performance of their duties, are two points second to no others in importance, touching the future of the proposed establishment.

Of the second class we need only say that we have already had too many of them in our country, and that they and their like have been mainly the cause of the decay and contempt into which some of our most important and valuable studies have already fallen, and towards which others are rapidly advancing. These men are just as ready to teach Chinese as astronomy; it matters not to them whether you appoint them professors of chemistry or of the Semitic tongues—psychology and ontology on the one hand, and palæography and hieroglyphics on the other, are equally within the range of possibility for them. They never possessed beyond a smattering of any science in their lives, and they are incapable of conceiving that any more than such superficial flimsy knowledge is desirable; nay, it is questionable whether they realize its existence. The student soon fathoms them, and thus first acquires that most woful of all pieces of knowledge, *i. e.*, that his professor is ignorant, and talks trash, intending to palm it off for truth, sense, and profundity; and we repeat that there is no subsequent fact or experience in life that ever comes to the man, freighted with such abidingly dismal consequences both to mind and heart, as does this discovery to the student. For

discover it he will; and just in proportion to his previous confidence and implicit trust is the likelihood greater of the shipwreck of the entire fabric of his future life. We want and will have no such professors. Our university is to be Catholic, thorough, genuine; and the information, the culture imparted must be Catholic, must be reliable, must be true.

But we are not confined to either of the two classes above mentioned. There are to be found, we know, among the present professors of our country, and among those gentlemen, both clerical and lay, whose pursuits have been of a literary character (though they may not heretofore have been occupied in teaching), men in the prime of life, thoroughly masters of individual subjects, who have pursued their favorite studies from motives of taste and love of the branches to which they have devoted themselves, and who would enter upon their duties as professors in the university, *con amore*, possessing all the qualifications that are required in successful instructors. These men, from their entire mastery of a given subject, are competent to render its details interesting to students, ready and able to answer all questions, to solve all difficulties, and who do not conceive (like the young ladies who graduate) that they have yet exhausted their branch, but who study, read, and investigate day by day, who peruse everything of value that appears upon their topic, who would grace the chairs to which they should be appointed, and shed lustre upon the institution, instead of deriving importance from their connection with it. Here, of course, it is not intended (and it would be invidious) to particularize; but that there are gentlemen fully answering the requirements laid down, all who have a tolerable acquaintance with the Catholic society of the country are thoroughly aware. We fully believe that there are enough of such gentlemen, true Catholics and thorough scholars, to enable us to fill all or most of the necessary chairs on opening the university. Yet, withal, it will behoove those having charge of the appointments to be very careful whom they shall select. For there are able scholars who are as incompetent to teach as though they knew but little; there are men again who possess in a high degree the faculty of imparting instruction, but who lack any valuable knowledge to communicate; while we have seen yet others who, possessing both the knowledge and the requisite facility in imparting it, have, for lack of disciplinary or other subordinate ability, failed most egregiously as teachers. The three qualities must combine in the successful professor, no one being of any avail without the other two, and the last mentioned, being the gift of nature, is not to be acquired by any course of training. The qualities essential to the teacher are not conferred by any normal school, and cannot be acquired. Even the best students of the first European

universities are not *ipso facto* teachers; in fact it is only in this country that the idea took form of establishing schools in which the pupils *should be taught to teach*—a scheme not unlike that of establishing a training school for the command of armies in the field; normal academies which shall turn out poets to order; or the institute in which Van der Hoeft proposed to instil presence of mind *vis-a-vis du danger*. From what we have said, it is clear that there will be no insuperable difficulties in the way of procuring professors; and should we even find ourselves obliged to import from Europe our first professors of some few branches, we have yet to learn that science is of any special country. It is generally admitted that Harvard College did an honorable thing for herself, and reflected credit upon our common country, when she secured the services of an Agassiz; and Princeton is justly applauded for giving to our country the high benefits of the educational skill of McCosh.

To our mind it seems probable that the most serious difficulty will be presented by the third question, as to the likelihood of our being able, at the outset, and indeed for some time to come, to furnish a sufficient number of young men, whose preparation has been of such a nature, and whose attainments are such, as to enable them to profit by the grade of instruction which must be imparted in a university at all worthy of the name, and we do not advocate the establishment of any other. To this may be added, the discouraging nature to our precocious American youth of the information that more thoroughness in all the studies, superadded studies to those at present pursued, frequent and rigid examinations in every branch, and at least three years more of close application than is now usual, will be absolutely necessary under the new *régime*. For such is the fact; and it is useless to avoid meeting the issue squarely. Either we must continue to depend for our educated men upon our present scrambling college arrangements, confessedly "tried and found wanting"—a few more years of which will almost render the establishment of a university in this country impossible for all time—or, our colleges must be relegated (we should say *elevated*) to their proper position of *gymnasien* or *academies*—tenders to the university—which, by greater thoroughness in teaching, more rigid and exacting examinations, and an extension of their *cursus studiorum*, they can all become. We shall subsequently see what changes in them would be necessary to effect this result. And here it is by no means our idea (since it would be absurd in itself) that all students of the colleges should pursue the studies necessary for admission to the university, as there are many young men who merely wish to be prepared for active business life, and the time occupied in studies absolutely essential or highly important to the professional or scientific man would be comparatively unproductive of practical

results to them. There would be no reason why the colleges should not have two courses—the higher, or *gymnasial* course being confined to aspirants for the professions, and, consequently, for the university; and the lower, or practical, course, similar to that of the German *real-schulen*, in which namely, young men intended for business pursuits should acquire a complete education for all the ordinary purposes of life, with the exception of the learned professions. In Germany, these are separate institutions from the *gymnasien*, and may be said to represent what is called the modern side of education, as opposed to the classical. But, in the *real-schulen* general culture is by no means ignored, Latin being, in all cases, a necessary part of the course, while to modern languages special attention is paid.

In some studies the student ought to know more on his matriculation at the university, than he does now on graduating at our best colleges. On all the studies pursued at our average institutions he will need to be fully as well prepared for entrance at the university, as for graduation at the college. This is no fault of the university nor of those who advocate its establishment, but of the colleges which have been for years imparting knowledge and conferring degrees in the loose and slipshod manner which has at length necessitated the movement for the introduction of the university system, without which it would seem as though we should soon have no learning at all beyond the grade of magazine literature. Our best scholars admit and lament the decay of classical knowledge among us. Who that knows the facts would care to champion the results of our college classes in history? Is it any better in mental or moral science? Will any one undertake to say that the higher mathematics and applied mathematics are pursued to an extent worth mentioning in one out of twenty of our colleges? We need not go the round of the course. Feebleness and inadequacy of instruction is the rule; thoroughness and its consequent valuable results are the rare exception! This thing must have an end, unless we are willing to become a laughing-stock to the cultivated nations of the earth; and we are not yet prepared to predicate that of our countrymen. Now the German *gymnasien* demands as a rule nine years' study; and the purely academic, *i. e.*, the non-professional *cursus* at the university, cannot be accomplished under three years. Nearly the same time is required to pass through the colleges and University of France. In England the public schools occupy at least five years, and the purely academic studies preparatory to the baccalaureate, four more. The professional studies proper in theology, law, or medicine, yet remain, and can in no case be completed under three years; and in none of the countries mentioned can a student be legally admitted to professional studies, until he

has regularly made his literary course. It would be fair *primâ facie* evidence—admitting time, attention, able professors, and frequent examinations to mean anything—that the student who has spent fifteen consecutive years in study (nine in gymnasium, three in academics, and three in professional studies), as in Prussia or France—must necessarily be a riper scholar, and by consequence a safer legal adviser, a more reliable physician, and a more competent, thorough divine, at the age of 27 to 30, than his compeer in the United States, who, at the utmost, and fulfilling all the requirements of courtesy—there are essentially no legal enactments on the subject—finishes his entire course, from Latin grammar up to B. A., in six years, and in two years thereafter, say at the age of 20 to 21, comes out a full-fledged doctor, lawyer, or preacher. Bear in mind that our medical and legal institutions make no demand upon their students for any previous academic course whatever; so that, while there are in the United States many lawyers and doctors who have made a full academic course—some, indeed, who have gone to Europe for the purpose—the great majority of the members of both professions in our country have never made even the ordinary academic course of our American colleges—few of them pretend to know Latin or Greek, and it is neither by law of the land, nor by statute of their professional schools, incumbent on them to know either. Well, it is not a pleasant or a dignified showing for our country, but "*pity 'tis, 'tis true!*" And this is just what we Catholics—who, according to the current belief (real or pretended) of Protestants, are so fearful of education, and so bitterly opposed to it—wish to remedy, so far as in us lies, and so far, at least, as we are concerned, by founding a university.

Now we admit that the prospect will not seem an alluring one to the youth who has the whole of his course of studies, or even any considerable portion of it, yet before him; and unless he should be a young man of exceptional good sense, or possessed of an amount of valuable reading, rather unusual with our young men in college, he will not be inclined to view the proposed improvement with favorable eyes. But he has parents, who are probably sensible people amenable to reason, and who when once convinced of the best course for the temporal and eternal welfare of their son, will not hesitate to carry out the results of that conviction. Many fathers are themselves scholars, who know and appreciate the facts of the case as well as the most ardent partisans of the university system. Many have, in fact, been for years in the habit of sending their sons and wards to Europe for the purpose of procuring that education, which, by the foundation of a university, we propose to impart henceforward in the United States. Besides which, the fourth commandment has not been abolished in the Catholic Church,

sed valet vigetque, and the young man who does not of himself see the propriety of the lengthened course of study, may be brought to perceive it in the light of that precept; while we trust that the influence brought to bear upon him at the university will soon enable him personally to realize its advantages to himself on purely mental grounds, and the instruction that we herein advocate will have been comparatively a failure morally and mentally, unless he speedily appreciates the advantages to which he will then have access. So that, while we consider this essentially the greatest difficulty to be surmounted, it is yet not an insuperable one, and we fully believe that by some slight compromises or modifications in the requirements for admission during the first four years,—modifications rendered unavoidable by the defects of the college systems under which our young men are now being trained,—the new system might be inaugurated, so soon as the needful arrangements could be completed, with a fair quota of students from its inception.

The feasibility is made out then (1), by the fact that Catholic means are abundant and Catholic charity ample to furnish the initial funds necessary to a fair inauguration of the enterprise; (2), because, once in operation, it will be frequently advanced in capacity of usefulness by donations, bequests, and foundations; (3) because we can readily secure competent professors, and shall only need to exercise care in excluding those who would be likely rather to injure than to benefit the institution; (4), because, what with young men whose own reading has brought them to a knowledge of the defects of our American mode of instruction, those parents who shall, by the agitation of the subject, become convinced of the fact; and (5), the example and influence of those scholarly parents and guardians who have, all along, proceeded on the conviction that the university plan of education is the correct one, we shall have no trouble in filling our lecture-benches from the beginning. Full well do we know that when the proposed plan shall have been once properly put in working order and set fairly in operation, all difficulty and all objection will either have vanished or will soon disappear.

Having thus remarked, we hope satisfactorily, on two of the proposed points,—and our article having in the performance attained those dimensions beyond which the reader rarely pursues with interest a subject not personal to himself,—we shall postpone the consideration of the remaining divisions of the general idea until the next number of this REVIEW, in which we hope to suggest an outline *project* for the establishment indicated, make some proposals for its governance, glance at the duties of the professors, and take a cursory view of the regulations that will be necessary among the students.

THE INQUISITION.

History of the Inquisition, in every Country where its Tribunals have been established, from the Twelfth Century to the Present Time. By William Harris Rule, D.D., London: Wesleyan Conference Office, 1868. 8vo. pp. 464.

History of the Inquisition, from its Establishment in the Twelfth Century to its Extinction in the Nineteenth. By William Harris Rule, D.D. 2 vols., 8vo., pp. 367, 360. London, Hamilton Adams & Co., 1874.

THE Inquisition! Is it well to touch the subject? Is it not a subject better left alone, to die out with the dead past to which it belongs? No. So long as history is written and history is read, there remains the necessity of placing this matter right on the record, inasmuch as there will not be wanting those ready to place it wrong.

There is no subject which Catholics seek to avoid. Our doctrines, our principles, are distinct and explicit. That individuals have, at all times, in the long period covered by the history of the Church, been guided by the laws of absolute justice towards their fellow-men is not pretended; and the error, whether springing from an evil heart or misguided reason, can be honestly condemned.

Least of all need Catholics avoid the question of religious coercion, take what form it will. Every impartial mind must admit that there has been on the part of the Catholics, a bold, frank, manly course, doing openly what they did, and assuming the responsibility of their acts; while on the part of their enemies, there has been too often hypocrisy, tergiversation, underhand work, and cowardice. Take even, as an example, the Tudor sisters. In Mary there is a Catholic queen, who, on attempting to ascend the throne of her father and brother, finds a nest of conspirators and traitors arrayed to deprive her of her rights. The people rallied to her; the traitors were in her hands. Every one of them had forfeited his head; in any other reign every head had fallen. Mary pardoned their offence against herself; but for their offence against religion, she left them to be dealt with by the laws then in force. Her craftier sister sought to crush the still powerful Catholic body in England, a body embracing the masses of the people. To punish priest or noble, lady or scholar, for believing or praying as their ancestors had done for centuries, was rather a difficult point. Call it heresy she could not, so she assumed a hypocritical liberality. Catholics were not to be punished for their religion, but for high treason; and being a priest, saying mass, corresponding with Rome,

having documents issued at Rome, were made high treason in the priest; and in the people it was high treason to hear mass, go to confession, have Catholic books or articles of devotion; in a word, all that St. Augustine did in introducing Christianity into Saxon England, became high treason. On the scaffold, ministers took care to din into the ears of Catholic victims that they were not put to death for their religion, but for high treason; though, at the same time, life was offered at the price of apostasy.

Now let fair men answer, which sister's reign shows straightforward honesty, and which acted the lie. Catholics have not resorted to shams.

The question of religious coercion on the part of governments, leads back to the question as to the real object and scope of government.

Under the Roman empire, the emperor was not only head of the State, but as Pontifex Maximus head of the religion of the State; in their mythology he was a sort of demi-god, passing in due time by an apotheosis among the greater gods. With Constantine, the first Christian emperor, a new order began. In the new Christian world, the emperor was head of the State, but he was not pontiff, nor bishop, nor priest, nor deacon; he was simply a layman; religion for him had no greater sacrament, no holier rite, than she imparted to the humblest beggar; he was a member of the Church, not its maker or ruler.

But had the head of the State, as such, no duties in regard to religion? Was government instituted solely to regulate man as an animal? Did there lie upon the prince no responsibility for the salvation of his people? The example of the Jewish kings and sound reason established the principle, that the prince was responsible for the spiritual as well as the temporal well-being of his people, as much bound to guard their souls against a moral pestilence of evil doctrine, as to guard their bodies against an epidemic or plague.[1] The duty of the parent in his family was, on a larger scale, that of government.

In modern days the theory is advanced, though by no means absolutely carried out in practice, that government has nothing to do with the matter of the people's salvation; and that, so far from helping them heavenward, it may, if it will benefit trade, or the

[1] "The emperor, in virtue of being the protector and secular arm of the Church, now assumes the title of 'Episcopus ad extra,' and considers himself absolutely bound to punish by exile and other penalties, those heretics who should disturb the peace of the Church." Hefele, Life of Cardinal Ximenes, p. 277. Rule, in the first work at the head of our article, admits the same: "Constantine, *as a matter of course*, discouraged freedom of utterance where such freedom seemed inexpedient, and denied liberty of worship to idolaters and heretics. His edicts or constitutions became part of the civil law of Christian Europe." The second edition has substantially the same statement.

treasury, or officeholders, help them a little on the way to destruction. This, however, is an outgrowth of modern indifferentism in religion, as well as mistrust of governments. It was not the doctrine which prevailed during the greater portion of the period from the accession of Constantine to our century. During the whole of this period, government was regarded as responsible for the faith of the people.

Protestantism accepted this part of the common law of Europe; and, wherever it got power, compelled the people to renounce Catholicity, its creed, worship, religious orders, devotions, and to embrace the new forms by law established. Nowhere was it left to the choice of the individual or congregation to adhere to the old or embrace the new; and that new creed once embraced, no liberty was given to make further changes.

Where there is an infallible criterion of divine truth, what it condemns as error must be such. Yet Protestantism, in all its various forms, scouted the very idea of any such infallibility. It was and is still the boast of each Protestant sect that it is fallible, and therefore in its teaching possibly if not probably fallacious.[1] It consequently never could logically condemn anything as error, while it claimed that it was not itself undoubtedly free from error. And to punish dissent from its doctrines was contrary to all reason.

In the countries where Protestantism was free from dynastic influence, and a majority of the people, in numbers or energy, formed a new creed, as in Switzerland, Holland, and New England, the very idea of liberty and toleration was scouted. Servetus died at Geneva, not so much for his anti-Trinitarian doctrines, for Calvin himself avoids the question of the Trinity, but for gainsaying this power. Grotius at Lowenstein could scarcely have regarded his persecutors as champions of civil and religious liberty. And in that New England which anathematized a clergyman for feebly expressing a doubt whether Catholics might not be saved, the writer's earliest American ancestor, Nicholas Upshall, whom Longfellow depicts so estimably in his New England Tragedies, died—though the poet says it not—in prison for the crime of advising that the state should be tolerant.[2] It was then part of the common law of Europe, that the State should by its machinery preserve the people from religious error. Now, how was this to be done? The Church

[1] *Falsum*, after all, is only the supine of *fallo*.

[2] Protestantism has nearly abandoned religious coercion. Mr. Rule, with the fearful list of English atrocities against the English and Irish Catholics, with the excesses in Scotland, the oppression of the patriotic Catholic Netherlanders, the extermination of the heroic Dalecarlians, and the massacre of Glencoe, before him, candidly exclaims (1st edition, p. 101) when condemning Catholics: "I leave my readers to consider whether this punishment of an error of the understanding was consistent or not with the doctrine of the Gospel."

pronounced its decision as to the doctrine; the State fixed and inflicted the punishment. It remained then either to have courts for such cases, with recognized proceedings, judicial forms, appeals, and means to secure justice; or to leave such cases to the heated public opinion of the moment, the caprice of mob or legislator. No sane man will pretend that the former is not the proper course to attain the ends of justice. If then the charge is made: "No church but that of Rome ever had an Inquisition," it simply asserts that no other instituted tribunals to secure the due administration of justice, as the laws were then understood.

To secure justice, the laws in regard to religion must be precise, notorious, and clear; the court must be impartial and free, and its forms and legal proceedings recognized and established.

In the first matter, the Catholic religion, not confined to one state or country, was in regard to her doctrines fixed beyond state control; but Protestant States and governments, reviving the pagan idea of combining in the person of the prince the civil and pontifical powers, made and unmade religions, creeds, worships, and tenets at their option; and in consequence their laws were as uncertain and perplexing as they well could be. In Catholic States they were at least precise, notorious, and clear.

The penal laws against Catholics and even against fellow-Protestants passed in England and her colonies, in Scotland, Holland, Sweden, Denmark, and Germany have never been collected; such as have been brought together at times make a revolting picture, the study of which would change some popular ideas. Nevertheless, such a study is necessary to an impartial appreciation of the history of religious coercion. And yet, in these states Catholics were not men introducing new ideas, assailing existing institutions, or destroying aught; they were simply men who asked to be allowed to retain the faith and practices of their fathers from the very introduction of Christianity.

The ordinary courts were not even trusted in many cases with the proceedings against Catholics. Lawyers and judges are especially attached to precedents and strict construction. In England the government often feared to allow Catholics to appear before judge and jury, and resorted to that last device of tyrants, special tribunals, courts-martial, and the like.

Turn now to the Catholic States. The doctrines of the Catholic Church were known and distinct. The first labors of the printing press on its invention were to disseminate, in the language of the Church and in the vernacular, the Scriptures and works explaining Catholic doctrine. While in the Protestant States all was uncertainty and doubt, and a man in good faith might often be far removed from the State creed when he tried to approach it more

nearly; there was no doubt in Catholic States as to the faith. The laws of the State were, therefore, easily understood. What was condemned was apparent to the most unlearned.

Instead of packed juries, star chambers, courts-martial, there was a court of competent judges,—the Inquisition.

The question then comes, What was the Inquisition, when was it established, in what countries did it exist, and what has been its course?

A common assertion often met with, and specially refuted by the late illustrious Lacordaire, ascribes the Inquisition to St. Dominic. Rule admits that the charge is untenable. "We have also to note and to remember that the Inquisition was not the work of Theodosius, or Innocent, or Dominic, or the College of Cardinals; but that it grew up spontaneously." The penal laws of Constantine and his successors had with little variation been adopted by the governments of the states of renewed Europe, and the machinery for enforcing them was adapted to meet the circumstances of different countries. The Arian emperors, Constantius and Valens, not only used these laws to harass the Catholics, but were the first Christian princes to punish with death those who differed from them in religion. The first exercise by Catholics of capital punishment for heresy was at Treves in 385, and it excited such deep indignation that many bishops, like St. Martin of Tours, refused all fellowship with those who had so far forgotten the mild genius of Christianity as to take part in the proceeding.

As time went on, however, the general opinion sustained the right of civilized government to inflict capital punishment in cases of heresy.

For a long time there was little occasion for the enforcement of the laws or the infliction of penalties.

In process of time new heresies sprang up, and these differed from the earlier Eastern heresies in their whole character. Those of the East were intellectual, turning on abstract doctrines. The new heresies of the West embraced social and political ideas, and were rather civil outbreaks with religious pretexts, than doctrinal theories leading to natural results in the body politic.

Church and State alike assailed by Albigenses, Lollards, Waldenses, Hussites, made common cause against them; and in the strife that ensued it is not always easy, or possible even, to draw the line between the civil and ecclesiastical orders in their action. This state of things has continued to the present time.

The Albigenses in Gascony first led to new enactments and the institution of new proceedings. These heretics not only boldly proclaimed their errors, but made the overthrow of Catholicity by violence a principle. They attacked the Catholics, destroying churches,

shrines, and priests, and practicing great cruelties; "sparing," according to the recital in a decree of the Third Lateran Council, in 1179, "neither churches, widows, nor orphans." This council passed severe decrees, and that of Verona directed bishops to appoint three or four persons to denounce heretics, who were then to be summoned before the bishop's tribunal. In 1206 Peter de Castelnau and other Cistercians were sent to the south of France as apostolic missionaries and legates, to endeavor to regain to the faith those who had been led away by the Albigensian preachers. These Cistercians were joined by zealous Spaniards, among the rest by Domingo Guzman. This last, better known as St. Dominic, the founder of the order of Friars-Preachers, or Dominicans, is often regarded as the first Grand Inquisitor, but without the slightest foundation. His order, however, founded especially to check by sound preaching the further progress of error, extended from Spain to Southern France, and thus placed at the disposal of bishops, zealous, capable men suited for the work of reclaiming the erring. As the Inquisition took form, the Dominicans became identified with it, so that Innocent IV. in 1248 invested them with as full inquisitorial powers as bishops possessed.

The first real Inquisition was instituted by the Council of Toulouse in 1229. By Chapters I. and II., archbishops and bishops in their dioceses and exempt abbots in their districts were to appoint in all parishes a priest and several laymen of good repute, and to bind them by oath zealously and faithfully to search for the heretics in their districts, and to report them, as well as their abettors, to the bishop, the lord of the district, or their representatives. The third chapter calls on secular lords to find out the heretics and destroy their hiding-places. In this we see the result of a civil war just concluded, in which those who were rebels to the Church were also rebels to the State; and as their long opposition to the State had been in a measure the work of discontented nobles, provision was made to prevent a repetition. Chapter IV. threatened with a loss of their dominions those who harbored heretics knowingly. Chapter V. punished more lightly those who by negligence allowed them to find refuge in their dominions. Chapter VI. ordered every house to be razed in which a heretic was found. Chapter VII. punished severely negligent officials. Chapter VIII. protected the innocent or falsely accused. Chapters X. and XI. regulated those who returned to the faith. Chapter XII. prescribed an oath of fidelity and a promise to denounce heretics. Chapter XIII. made those neglecting to receive communion three times a year, suspected of heresy. The use of the Scriptures by the preachers of heresy in misleading the people led to Chapter XIV., by the provisions of which no layman was to have a Bible, or any

portion of the same except the Psalms, nor any other books save the Breviary and the Office of the Blessed Virgin."

In all these proceedings we see the action of local feeling under the exasperation of falsehood, violence, and rapine; but the fears of similar results in other kingdoms gave the course adopted at Toulouse a widespread influence. This council is, therefore, regarded as instituting the first real Inquisition, although it still left the bishops invested with judicial power. Inquisitors, with similar powers to those created by the Council of Toulouse, were appointed by Pope Gregory IX. in Italy in 1231, and in Germany by Frederic II. in 1239.

It will be necessary to see how far the stringent provisions of the Council of Toulouse were carried out. Rule, bigoted, violent, and prejudiced as he is, says: "The Inquisition as a permanent court was, at the worst of times, less conspicuous in France than in some other countries." . . . "Priests allowed Frenchmen, who fled from their dwellings for fear of the Inquisition, to take refuge in the churches, where by right of asylum they were safe." As established in Spain at this time, the action of the Inquisition seems to have been no less tempered with mercy. There are, even in Rule, no horrors to relate of heretics suffering at the hands of the Inquisitors. But while France had its political and social institutions racked by the violence of its civil and religious heretics, Spain was suffering from the immense power acquired by the Jews. That people had for centuries been a source of uneasiness to the Christians. Men like Rule, who are guided by blind passion and prejudice, will say, "they were the most industrious, and therefore the most wealthy people in those kingdoms;" "the artificers and merchants by whose means chiefly the prosperity and intelligence(!) of Spain were maintained;" but the history of that people wherever it has been scattered shows that these terms need explanation. Industrious as increasers of national wealth by agriculture or mechanical arts, the Jews seldom are; shrewd merchants, money lenders, inventors, and speculators in securities for money, they are and have been. Without labor they succeed in various lands in accumulating a wonderful proportion of the national wealth compared to their numbers; and on this point our own country is furnishing a striking example. The impoverishment of the many for the benefit of the few, whether that few be Jew or Christian, has caused and will cause popular hatred, and finally government action. The Gothic kings of Spain deprived Jews of many civil rights enjoyed by Christians, a system pursued till recently by Protestant England, which has only within a very few years opened to the Jews her colleges and legislative halls. The severe laws of the Gothic kings led to a conspiracy on the part of the Jews to bring in the Saracens. Its defeat saved

Spain, but deepened the distrust entertained towards the Jews, who, after the overthrow of the Gothic monarchy, sided warmly with the new Saracen rulers of Spain.

The decline of the Moslem power brought up again the Jewish question. On the one hand efforts were made by zealous preachers to win them to Christ; on the other, popular hatred led to mobs and riots against the usurers who drained the very life of the people. The cases before the Inquisition during this period were of Jews who relapsed into Judaism, or whose Christianity was merely a mask. Of these, by all accounts, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish, there were many, some of these Hebrews actually carrying their hypocrisy so far as to be admitted into the ranks of the clergy.[1] The feeling of horror in a Catholic community, to find that the holiest rites of the New Law had been a mockery performed by Jews whose hearts were filled with hatred of Christ, would naturally lead to punishment that knew no mercy. Yet, even with this, the severities charged on this earlier Inquisition in Spain are not great. To atone for this historical deficiency Llorente was sadly at a loss; but one arithmetical rule he had studied thoroughly, and that was multiplication. The author, whose work has led to these remarks, deserves as well the name of Mathematical Rule, for he adopts the monstrous assertions of the Spanish author. "Llorente," says he, "estimates the number of Jews who perished under the fury of mobs in the year 1391 at upwards of one hundred thousand."[2] The massacres of history pale before this unheard-of slaughter, and yet for events occurring at the very entrance of the century that witnessed the invention of printing we might expect some regard for probability, if not for truth. There is not a particle of contemporaneous evidence of any such slaughter of the Jews in Spain.

Nor is the Inquisition of this period in Portugal arraigned. Italy, even Italy of the popes, furnishes little matter for denunciation. To such as Rule, a relapsing Jew, Pagan, or Saracen would be one of "Our Lord's martyrs," had he but died at the hands of the Inquisition; for, with a generosity without restraint, he requires no other mark of conversion. What must have been the state of the case when of Italy he writes: "It is to be regretted that we have no means of enlivening and hallowing the present sketch by recit-

[1] Borrow, Bible in Spain, ch. xi. Grace Aguilar in many of her writings. Rule apparently has too lax ideas to condemn this. He censures John Philibert (2d ed., vol. 1, p. 50) for hesitating to swear to his disbelief in Albigensian doctrines, in which he really believed. "His conscience, more scrupulous than enlightened, could not submit to a judicial abjuration." If this means anything, it means that in Dr. Rule's opinion a man with an enlightened conscience may swear to a falsehood.

[2] Second ed., vol. 1, p. 122. It is unwise in a follower of Wesley to make it a crime in a clergyman to excite a mob to violence against religious opponents. Mr. Rule should not have thus condemned John Wesley for his part in the Lord George Gordon riots.

ing any triumphs of our Lord's martyrs, *for some such there must have been.*" He can gather but a few cases, and then admits: "The Inquisition in Italy was nearly dormant from the time of its last effort in Piedmont (1307) until the reign of Pope Calixtus III." (1458).[1] Then a new movement was made against the Waldenses.

Of this earlier Inquisition, then, after the excitement of the time and place where it arose, there is nothing to distinguish its operations from those of the laws of Constantine, except the form of tribunal and the introduction of a system of detectives. Had there been nothing more to be charged to the Inquisition than this, we should hear little denunciation of it. In all the manifold writings of the early reformers of the sixteenth century, and the religious organizations they established, not one took the ground that the Church had not the right to condemn error, and to hand over the obstinate and impenitent to the secular arm for punishment, even to the extent of taking life. Not one denounced the use of torture in such cases. Nor do those who attack this earlier Inquisition pretend that the findings of the court were not sustained by evidence; indeed, they admit that the doctrines charged were really entertained.

Yet in all countries where the Inquisition has existed, except in Spain and Portugal, it has existed as thus organized.

Protestantism accepted it really though not in name. Calvin, and Beza, and Coligny stimulated the killing on the spot and mutilation of the Catholic clergy and religious, waiving all trial; and in the writings of the Reformers, and their early disciples, there is no condemnation of the constantly occurring murders of Catholic priests and religious at the altar and elsewhere, or of the pillage and destruction of Catholic altars and shrines. The disciples of the Reformers learned from them, and believed that they had an absolute right to do these things. England had its pursuivants, its priest-takers, its mock priests as detectives, its torture-chambers, and its rack; and, when even penal laws seemed too lax, organized special tribunals to execute by martial law. Not a principle or practice connected with the Inquisition lacks Protestant sanction.

Of course, in our times, when all this is condemned, there is the constant endeavor to forget all that had ever been done in the name of the Reformation, to make this dark picture disappear beneath some convenient veil; while the scenes in which they can sympathize with the sufferers, or denounce the actors, receive new and glaring colors. But this will not do. The thing is either right or wrong. Government has power to coerce in religion, or it has not. If New Hampshire may justly punish the obstinate Catholic by denying to him the right to hold office, as New York and other States have

[1] Vol. 2, p. 161.

done, she then revives the Inquisition in principle. New Jersey and Ohio may justly by law enact that all Catholics, in their penal or eleemosynary institutions, must be deprived of the opportunity of attending their own worship, being instructed in their own religious doctrines, and receiving the ordinances of their Church; or if these States have not in reality the right to do this, then they revive the Inquisition in principle without any logical ground to base it upon. Virginia in the last century punished Catholics with a host of penalties, double taxes, privation of the elective franchise, and of the right to hold office, and even of competency as witnesses. The right to inflict these punishments involves the right to go further, and if Virginia could impose these, she could add imprisonment and death. Massachusetts, in the case of the Quakers, so held and so acted. The followers of Fox were arrested, put to torture, and executed. New York condemned any priest to imprisonment for life, and if he escaped and were retaken, to death. Our own land, therefore, affords evidence of the Protestant claim that the civil power has jurisdiction in matters of religion, may have trial of such kind as seems fit, may use torture, may punish with loss of civil rights, imprisonment, or death.

In Spain and Portugal, however, the Inquisition as revived in the time of Ferdinand and Isabella took, it will be said, a new and terrible form, and while acting on the principles and in the modes sanctioned by the laws of the past thousand years and by the actual practice in Protestant countries, carried out its sentences with a ferocity and to an extent unparalleled.

What, then, was the Spanish Inquisition, and what was its influence on the Inquisition as already existing in other countries? Are the statistics given of its victims historic or merely polemical, cooked up for the special purpose of making a sensation in order to attain certain objects? With an investigation of these points we will close.

Ferdinand and Isabella, while at Seville, in 1477–8, were solicited by Philip de Barberis, Inquisitor of Sicily, Alonzo de Ojeda, prior of San Pablo, in Seville, and Diego de Merlo, a magistrate, to reestablish a tribunal for the trial of those charged with heresy, or relapse into Mohammedanism or Judaism. On the 1st of November, 1478, Pope Sixtus IV. authorized the sovereigns to establish a tribunal for searching out and punishing heretics, which was to consist of two or three dignitaries of the Church, who might be either seculars or regulars, according to the wish of the sovereigns, provided the said dignitaries were at least forty years of age, of pure morals, bachelors of theology, or doctors of canon law. This preliminary Bull was issued on a very imperfect representation of the royal intentions, and evidently anticipated only a revival of

the tribunals already known. When the whole plan of the proposed tribunal was made known, the Pope condemned it as contrary to the decrees of the holy Fathers and the general practice of the Church.

Here, then, came a point of divergence. Sixtus approved an inquisition as contemplated, but censured the Spanish Inquisition when it took its distinct form, as something at variance with the common law of the Church. The Spanish Inquisition therefore stands apart. As to its character, Catholics as well as Protestants are divided. Among Catholics, some incline to regard it as exclusively a political institution. Of this school is Hefele, the author of an admirable life of Cardinal Ximenes, and a favorite with the Protestants from his attitude in the Vatican Council. In support of his view that it was a political institution, preserved and encouraged by kings and queens, for no other object than to advance the interests of the State, he cites the authority of the philosophic Count de Maistre, and of the Protestants Ranke and Guizot. But as Canon Dalton observes, this view is not held by Spanish writers, and seems not sustainable by facts. "That the Spanish Inquisition was not merely a political institution, but ecclesiastical also, seems to be a general opinion of most Spanish writers." Balmes (ch. xxxvi) asserts that it would be wrong in this affair to attribute all to the policy of royalty; the contemporary historical writers draw no such distinction; the later ones, with Lafuente, the general historian of Spain, on the very ground of a total want of historic support, reject the idea that the "Catholic sovereigns in re-establishing the Inquisition were influenced by political considerations, and intended to harmonize religious unity with political unity."

That it was an institution peculiar to Spain all admit; that it was established under the express censure of a pope; that it assumed almost absolute independence of Rome, prevented appeals, disregarded counsel, advice, exhortation, and even threats, is no less true. For the action of this tribunal the popes cannot be responsible, as they stand on record the earliest to protest against its excessive severity. Prescott, who blindly follows Llorente, when as an historical scholar he must have laughed in his sleeve at the bare idea of accepting such a man as authority, is very violent in his denunciation of this Inquisition, yet admits that in principle it was sustained by the theories of the time. But it was too much to be explicit. He involves it thus: "However mischievous the operations of the Inquisition may have been in Spain, its establishment in point of principle was not worse than many other measures which have passed with far less censure, though in a much more advanced and civilized age." (*History of Ferdinand and Isabella*, chap. xvi.)

The writer who has treated most fully of the Spanish Inquisition

was a Spanish priest, by name Juan Antonio Llorente, who was unfaithful to his duties alike as a patriot and a priest. Just before the close of the existence of the celebrated tribunal he was for a few years connected with it, and this gave weight to his pretended researches and documents as to its history. One fact stamps his work as a romance, and leaves Prescott, who wrote generally on transcripts of original documents from the Spanish archives, without the paltriest excuse for following such a man. This one fact is the statement made by Llorente himself, "that he burnt nearly all the official reports connected with the Inquisition, with the exception of those that related to the history of some of the most remarkable persons." (Edition 1818, p. 145.) Now, all who have made the slightest inquiry know that the Spanish archives are extremely rich, and that for a court which existed between three and four centuries the documents would be such that an ordinary lifetime would not suffice to go through them. The archives at Seville, relating to the colonies, are, for the earliest period, so ample that the late Buckingham Smith, a gentleman who spent years among them, and furnished Prescott himself with valuable material, told the writer, hopelessly, that the archives bearing on America seem inexhaustible, although scholars have been laboring among them for years. Prescott knew full well that Llorente could not have gone through the archives of the Inquisition in the most cursory manner in the time he devoted to the preparation of his work.

He had little or no documentary evidence. Hence his scheme to avoid being called upon to produce his authorities. Of all shallow and improbable stories commend us to this Llorente trick. Our late minister at Berlin issued, not long since, a volume of his *History of the United States*. It was received with violent opposition from some descendants of men of the Revolutionary era, who deemed their ancestors unjustly treated. Now, had Mr. Bancroft said in reply: "I wrote from documents in my hands of the highest authenticity, and followed them implicitly; nearly all these I have now burnt"—what a storm of ridicule would have greeted him! Did it ever enter into the head of Prescott, or Bancroft, or Motley, or any other historian, to destroy the documents he uses? On the contrary, they are often printed at length, sometimes reproduced in fac simile, to enable the reader to judge for himself of the handwriting, or of the real reading of the original.

In courts of law, one party may call on his antagonist to produce some paper in his hands, and on his neglect to do so, may prove by other testimony, what the contents of the paper were; but he would not be allowed to go on the stand to prove the contents of a paper which he himself had deliberately destroyed.

Certainly then Llorente is no authority. His book stands self-

condemned, a mere sensational work, sure of a market, and intended to reap the benefit of that market.

That Prescott used the book as authority, cites it page after page as an authentic work, is the greatest stigma on his character as an historian. He knew that the book was unworthy of his confidence.[1]

Of this Spanish Inquisition, the first objects were the Jews. The severities which caused the remonstrance of the Pope, caused opposition in Spain. If we believe Llorente, Prescott, Rule, and writers of that stamp, the Jews were always the best citizens and most devoted patriots in all countries, and especially in Spain at this time. But contemporary Spanish writers give us a different account, and represent the Jews at this period as guilty of the most terrible crimes; they acquired such strength and boldness as to attempt, in 1485, to capture Toledo, and massacre the Christians. How decide between contemporary writers, and men writing three centuries later, full of a certain philosophy of history? In our mind's eye there rises a school in 2100, pathetically describing the holy death of Joseph and Hiram Smith, and the fierce and sanguinary Protestant inquisitors of Illinois, calumniating, persecuting, and murdering the blameless saints. How grandly will the Llorente of that day push aside contemporary testimony as prejudiced!

We must believe that there was some foundation for the charges. There were good and upright men in Spain and in the Spanish government, who would have lent themselves as tools to no hypocritical massacre. The difficulty was that the whole body of the Jews was made to suffer for the misdeeds of individuals, not only in the prosecutions under the Inquisition, but in the final terrible blow, which drove all the children of Israel from Spain, exiles even from a land of exile. But even among us the Jews as a body

[1] For example, Llorente asserts that in 1481, the Inquisition of Seville ordered no less than 2000 to be burned in the two dioceses of Seville and Cadiz. Prescott adopts the statement, yet admits in a note that Marineo, a contemporary author, diffuses the 2000 over several years. Llorente cites Mariana, yet Prescott was familiar with Mariana, and knew that this is given by Mariana as the whole number burned under Torquemada, not in two dioceses, but in the two kingdoms of Castile and Arragon. Pulgar also (edition, 1787, p. 137) makes it the number burned at different times, and in certain cities and towns. Most of Llorente's general estimates are based on data similarly distorted, and in this way he calculates those burned at the stake by Torquemada at 10,220, exclusive of Jews, when contemporary accounts make only 2000 in all. Rule, as a matter of course, follows Llorente, and cites Mariana as though the text of Mariana supported this perversion of truth. "What shall we say of a sham that can only hope to be kept alive by perverting the known truth?" (Rule, as amended by us.) Yet all Rule's figures for Spain are drawn from Llorente, and he adheres to them as he says, "notwithstanding the customary charges of exaggeration and untruth, laid against him by modern admirers and apologists of the Holy Office." It is an index of this man's mind, that no one can question the authority of his favorite author without becoming an admirer and apologist of all the acts of the Spanish Inquisition.

suffer for the faults of evil individuals. General Grant for the irregularities of a few Jews, expelled all from his lines. Insurance offices make Jew risks a class which they shrink from taking. Yet these countrymen of the Blessed Virgin number many, whose probity, generosity, and sincerity entitle them to friendship and esteem.

The Jews in Spain suffered terribly. This forced exile, the loss on all that they had to sell, their hardships as they sought a new home, were such as to deserve the sympathy of all. Pope Alexander VI., Spaniard though he was, and not one whose name receives much honor in history, deserves credit for his reception of such of these poor fugitives as reached his States.

Ferreras, a careful Spanish historian, from statistics in the several provinces, makes the number exiled one hundred thousand, fewer than England annually drives of Catholics out of Ireland.

Llorente, however, says 800,000, citing Mariana, who mentions it simply as an exaggeration. Rule follows his leader without examination.[1]

Those Jews who remained in Spain did so by renouncing the Synagogue, and embracing Christianity. There would be but little reality in such wholesale conversions. The law which drove men to this hypocrisy, then set to work to discover and punish it. Among themselves they were still Jews, and in secret the prayers and customs of the Jews were observed. This backsliding, this relapse brought them within the jurisdiction of the Inquisition. Many acts, harmless in themselves, were regarded as signs of relapse and a denial of Christ.

After the revolts of the Alpujarras, the Moors too were exiled as a body, in 1572, and only such remained as chose to renounce Mohammed. Their conformity was generally only external, and frequent relapses into Islam made many cases for the Inquisition. It was established at Grenada by Diego de Deza, Grand Inquisitor after Torquemada, in order to prevent the relapsing of the Moriscos. The proceedings under it were, however, very lenient, and successive monarchs made every effort to render the Moors really Christians, but they were never thoroughly converted, and revolted repeatedly. This led to their final expulsion in 1609.

Rule is at a loss in this matter of the Moors. "I cannot relate," he says,—"for there is not, so far as I know, any record extant—the particulars of the inquisitorial persecution; but it is certain that,

[1] Vol. 1, p. 150. He complains, p. 149, that the synagogues "were turned into *mass houses* (sic) without any compensation." Now a certain mass house, called Westminster Abbey, was turned into a Protestant church without any compensation, as well as numbers of other Catholic mass houses. Catholics are willing to receive the proper compensation, if Protestants are ready to pay.

closely leagued with the royal power, the Inquisition crowded the dungeons, and fed the hearths."[1] So that if the terrible Spanish Inquisition condemned many relapsing Mohammedans, history is silent, and we are to believe imaginary horrors, because we must of necessity make out the Inquisition to be monstrous.

When the religious innovators in Northern Europe began their vagaries, and Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Cranmer, each introduced his new patent religious medicine for the cure of the world's ills, the authorities in Spain, both civil and ecclesiastical, marked the progress of the new politico-religious movements. Destruction of churches, chapels, monasteries, seats of piety and learning, the plunder of shrines and altars, the murder of priests and religious, marked their course as that of a new race of Goths or Huns. Where the new ideas once entered a country, the government had either to adopt them and lead the innovators on, or prepare for a struggle in which every element of ferocity would be called out, and in which the sovereign must crush or be crushed.

Navarre, on the Spanish frontier, adopted the new ideas, and Catholicity was exterminated. The Low Countries, under the same impulse, rose against Spain. To save itself, Spain put forth every effort. The Inquisition already in existence, and so severe as to have been censured by the popes, became still more stringent, and was, in the hands of the Spanish monarchs, the great engine for preventing the growth of the new ideas in the peninsula. To their eyes it was the only hope. The Protestant corsairs of France and England swooping on the rich Spanish fleets, as cruel as their fellow-believers on land, made the Spaniard deaf to mercy; and the Spanish Inquisition attained its most terrible form. But it was essentially a State institution. Its object was the security of the Spanish throne, and the kingly power scarcely acknowledged the Church in the matter. "The Inquisition was," says Ranke, "the means of completing the absolute authority of the king." It was entirely dependent on the king, who appointed the officers. Guizot takes the same view. "The Inquisition was at first more political than ecclesiastical, and destined rather to uphold order than to defend the faith."

In the form it then assumed, and the course it then adopted, the Church cannot in the slightest degree be held accountable for the Spanish Inquisition. It was as absolutely a State institution as Bismarck's ecclesiastical courts and Falk laws; imprisoning, confiscating, banishing. But we have the direct disapprobation of the popes. Before the Reformation, Pope Sixtus IV. remonstrated in the most forcible manner with Ferdinand; limited the power of the Inquisi-

[1] 1st ed., p. 126. 2d ed., vol. 1, p. 163.

tion to acting in concert with the bishops, and in 1483 established a judge of appeals from its decisions. Both Ferdinand and Charles V. endeavored in every way to thwart appeals to the Holy See, and at last demanded that all appeals should be addressed to the royal Minister of Justice. The popes interfered, too, to obtain clemency for the condemned, and to save their property for them and their children. Every effort was made to baffle the intervention of the popes, and appeals to them, so as to require, on the part of the Holy See, the most stringent action, as when Leo X. excommunicated the inquisitors of Toledo. It was the same under subsequent popes, who prevented the extension of the Spanish Inquisition to Italy. In view of all this, the Church at large or the sovereign pontiffs cannot, without a violation of all historic truth, be made responsible for the acts of the Spanish Inquisition. The burden lies with the absolute monarchy of Spain, with which it originated and with which it fell.[1]

Another point should be borne in mind. Those whom the popes honored for their piety and zeal for religion, even those whom the Church subsequently canonized as models for all Christians, were not exempt in life from the persecutions of the Inquisitions of Spain and Portugal. The Jesuits were from first to last obnoxious to the Inquisitions of the peninsula. The hostility seen in the arrest of St. Ignatius, the persecution of St. Francis Borgia, friend of Carranza, the arrest of the Provincial, and the attempt to censure the whole Order, in 1586, the action against the Bollandists, the persecution of Vieyra, the action of the Portuguese Inquisition against the Society of Jesus, and the burning of Father Malagrida; the hostility evinced in all these is too clear and positive to be questioned. And strange as it may seem, Jesuits help to swell the numbers of the sufferers for whom Llorente, and such blind followers as Rule, evoke the tears of Protestants. St. Ignatius, in forming his "flying camp" to attack the hosts of the Reformation, never dreamed that Protestants would one day be called to sympathize with him as a sufferer from the Inquisition.

Of canonized saints, not only St. Ignatius, St. Francis Borgia, but even St. Teresa was denounced to the Inquisition. Nor has any Grand Inquisitor or official of that later tribunal since the origin of Protestantism been beatified or canonized by the Church. The Church is the Church. The attempt of the Inquisition to set itself up as a church, an *imperium in imperio*, was crushed. Among those whom it persecuted, the Church found men to raise to her highest honors, but never conferred them on the persecutors. St. Francis de Sales, St. Vincent de Paul, St. John Francis Regis, Blessed

[1] Llorente's work admits clearly these efforts of the Pope to check the Inquisition in Spain.

Peter Canisius, Blessed Peter Faber, men who endeavored to regain those who fell away, but regain them by mildness, by reason, by exhortation; such are the men whom the Church publicly honors.

The Inquisition, whether in Spain or elsewhere, took cognizance not only of false religion and relapse into it, whether Judaism, Mohammedanism, or heresy, but also of all offences against religion, sacrilege, falsely personating the priesthood, witchcraft, blasphemy, crimes against nature, bigamy, perjury, and in some places purely civil offences, such as coining.

The attempts to introduce Protestantism into Spain attracted the attention of the Inquisition about the year 1541, and took form eighteen years later. Since the middle of the sixteenth century it has consequently been a name of horror in Protestant countries, and no exaggeration was too great to describe the number of the victims, the injustice of the judges, or the cruelty of the whole system. Historical calmness or impartiality, sound criticism, careful collation of authorities were all neglected, and the Spanish Inquisition is judged, even now, by many in comparison with the ideas and practices of the nineteenth century, not with those in which it flourished.

The course of proceeding employed by the Inquisition began with a public announcement of a time of grace, "during which every one, who, conscious of apostasy, presented himself and did penance, was to be absolved and saved from heavy punishments." Those under twenty might avail themselves of this opportunity even after the time had elapsed. The accused who did not appear, to avail themselves of this, were then subject to arrest. But the dungeons of the Inquisition, which play such a part in romances that pass for history, were models for their time. While even at a later date Howard found the prisons of Europe generally filthy and noxious; when the prisons in England were so vile that on one occasion the bringing of the Catholic prisoners to the bar caused a pestilence that swept off the judges, lawyers, and no small portion of the population, the prisons of the Spanish Inquisition were, as Llorente admits, "well-vaulted, light, and dry rooms. No prisoners ever groaned under the weight of chains, handcuffs, and iron collars."

The order of arrest could be issued only on the joint action of two inquisitors: one a jurist, the other a theologian. If the accusation were the use of heretical words or expressions, and the purport was not clear, it was referred to *qualificators*, to report whether they were really heretical.

The examinations were in the usual Spanish style, with long detailed written interrogatories, to which answers were required. But, it will be said, torture was used to compel the accused to answer

fully. This is undoubtedly the case; but it was no peculiarity of that court. It was part of the course of judicial investigation in all European countries. England used to claim that torture was never used, and the assertion of Catholics, that their clergy and laity were frequently tortured, was met by a bold denial, and the charge cited as showing to what wickedness Catholics would go in their accusations of Protestants. Lord Coke, Chief Justice of England's highest court, long attorney-general, declares positively in his printed works that he never knew a case of torture in England. The state papers of England have become accessible in our time. Jardine, an English writer, and not a Catholic, investigated this very question of the use of torture in England, on which he published a well-known work. He found numbers of examinations of prisoners taken under torture, found examinations taken by Lord Coke himself, with marginal notes directing the answers to be garbled when used in court. That was the English use of torture, and Llorente cites nothing in the Spanish Inquisition to match it.

The accused was allowed to have an advocate, and to compare the depositions with the act of accusation. The inquisitors were required to collect material for the defence, and aid the accused in his search for testimony. The sentence of the provincial tribunals was subject to the revision of the Grand Inquisitor and Council. One alleged defect in this judicial system was that the names of the witnesses were not given to the accused; but Ranke, in Germany, and Le Normant, in France, find reasons for withholding censure even on this. The accused had the right of naming personal enemies against whose testimony he protested.

It will be said that, wise as the precautions were to obtain justice and a prompt administration of it, they were often avoided. This is certainly the case, and the frequent appeals to Rome prove it, as they prove the wisdom of the popes in withholding their approval from the whole system.

Spain gave great publicity to the execution of the judgments of the Inquisition. In 1559 she began her Autos de Fe, "Acts of Faith," solemn parades of the convicted in a form to strike terror into all. Those condemned merely to do penance came in black coats and trowsers, bareheaded, and barefooted; the more guilty in a yellow sanbenito with a red cross; those condemned to death wore a sheepskin sacque with flames painted on it, and a pointed paper cap. On arriving at the appointed place the sentences were pronounced, and the guilty were handed over to the civil officers, who then inflicted the punishment. The first Auto de Fe in Spain took place at Valladolid, May 21st, 1559, when fourteen were burned. Two others took place in the same year. They continued more or less frequently to the close of the century, but in 1604 an

Auto was stopped by the king; and in that of 1621 no one was put to death. Rule admits (1, p. 289) that in the latter part of the last century sentences to death had nearly ceased.

Of the whole number who perished by the Spanish Inquisition it is not yet easy to obtain accurate data. Llorente estimates that from the institution under Torquemada to the year 1809, 31,912 were burnt, besides which 17,659 were burnt in effigy, and 291,450 were penitents. But we have seen already how recklessly Llorente applies numbers given for several years and different places to one year and one place, and then augments this for the kingdom, and again for a reign. His figures are utterly visionary, and if the number who perished in the Autos of the first year, 1559, be taken as an average, 39, and it is certainly above it,[1] the number from 1559 to 1759, when the executions may be said to have ceased, cannot exceed ten thousand, and probably falls far below it. If from this be deducted those who suffered for other causes than heresy, the number will not exceed, if it equals, that of Catholics put to death for their religion in the British Isles during the same periods, without taking into account the numbers of Catholics slaughtered in Ireland under Cromwell, which alone far exceed the numbers of burnt effigies and penitents of the Spanish Inquisition for its two centuries. The puerility of Llorente and Rule in parading as victims those burnt in effigy, and the adding of the great number of penitents can escape no man of sense.[2]

Spain extended the Inquisition to the New World in 1520, but not in definite form. Fifty years later three central tribunals were established at Lima, Mexico, and Cartagena. The first Auto took place in Mexico in 1574, but the number condemned to the flames was small; none were burned in the Auto of 1648, and only one in 1659. Drake, Hawkins, and other buccaneers were, in the earlier day, plundering the Spanish-American ships and seaside towns. Any of these pirates that fell into the hands of Spaniards were turned over to the Inquisition; but the blindest fanaticism will scarcely turn these ribald freebooters into martyrs of Christ.

The Portuguese Inquisition was established in 1536 by King John III., but the Pope, Paul III., soon complained of the severities and injustice that stained its course, and it required the absolute exertion of the papal authority to check the fury of the king, as

---

[1] Llorente himself gives 34 a year as his estimate for the reign of Philip V., not as based on any returns, but in his favorite way of calculating. The real average must have been undoubtedly much less.

[2] Among those who put a stop to the proceedings of the Inquisition, whether government or mob, there has been always a suspicious haste to destroy records. Many have thus perished unexamined, but the records of cases, and the issuing of death-warrants, must still exist in the central archives of the Spanish government.

Rule admits. This author admits that he can find no authentic matter for a sketch; there was no Portuguese Llorente to multiply endlessly the number of victims. One of his few cases is from Fox's Book of Martyrs, the case of a man who attacked a cardinal while saying Mass in the Cathedral. But the popes sought to abate the rigors of the tribunal in Portugal, and Clement X. addressed a brief to his Nuncio urging him to prevent, if possible, an intended Auto de Fe. Here, too, the Jesuits signalized themselves by their earnest labors to mitigate the rigors of the tribunal, and they became in the highest degree obnoxious to those who were bent on carrying out its system. From Portugal the Inquisition extended to Brazil and India, and the acts of the tribunal at Goa are best known to English readers by Dellon's account, which Rule implicitly follows.

It is not pretended that those convicted of holding Protestant doctrines really did not hold them. On the contrary, it is admitted and claimed that in most cases they did, and that the conviction by the court was sound in point of fact. Cases undoubtedly occurred in this as in all other courts where innocence suffered and guilt escaped; our own times are not strangers to cases where poverty was an obstacle to the proof of innocence, and wealth makes it difficult to convict men of guilt.

When a person was convicted the punishment was death, imprisonment, or public penance. It is generally believed that, even for those times, the punishments inflicted by the Inquisition were unusually severe. That they were not, it will be necessary simply to compare them with the penal codes of other countries. The English penal code was terribly severe. The array of offences then punished with death, in its horrible forms of burning, half hanging, quartering, and disembowelling, is a fearful one. Even in these colonies the severity was great. Pressing to death was inflicted in New England; in New York, down to the Revolution, sacrilege (and stealing a book or a handkerchief in a church was sacrilege) was punished by death; and men were repeatedly convicted and sentenced under the law. The Carolina, a penal law of Germany under Charles V., enumerates execution by fire and sword, quartering, the wheel, gibbet, drowning, burying alive, the use of red-hot pincers, the cutting off the tongue, ears, hands, etc.

All this is repugnant to modern ideas, but it was once generally accepted as part of the criminal code, and the sentences inflicted by the Spanish Inquisition are really mild for their times.

The Inquisition in Italy, and especially in the Roman States, always retained more of its earlier form, and the bishops exercised more power. Its first operations were against the doctrine of the

Waldenses, but in the proceedings against them the Inquisition does not hold a conspicuous place.

When the Protestant movement began in Germany the courts of the Inquisition were aroused to meet the new errors, and prevent their introduction into the peninsula. Yet the cases that arose were comparatively few. Italy did not show any disposition to embrace the new views. Here and there a member of some religious order, or a professor in some university, would attempt to diffuse them, but the attempt was speedily arrested, and the people generally were so faithful to the Catholic Church that they were averse to a formal inquisition. Just after the summoning of the Council of Trent, Pope Paul III., in July, 1542, established a General Inquisition at Rome.

In its operations we find none of the characters of the Spanish Inquisition. There were executions for heresy from time to time, as there were in England at the same time executions for being priests or Catholics. Some of those punished for extravagant doctrines in Italy would have gone to the stake for them in England under Edward VI.

Of those who suffered in Italy, De Dominis, Giordano Bruno, and Aonio Paleario are best known to English readers. The bugbear of Galileo's sufferings comes, by his own letters, to have been very gentle dealing from a sovereign whom he had caricatured. Some of those punished in Italy, as in Portugal and elsewhere, were English fanatics, maddened by the teachings of the Reformers, who attacked priests at the altar, at the consecration, or in processions of the Blessed Sacrament. Priests were even assassinated by such zealots. It required no Inquisition to punish such violent offenders against the religion of the country in which they happened to be.

The Inquisition was reared for a time in the Low Countries to uphold the Spanish power, but fell with it.

Such is briefly and in outline the history of this famous tribunal and its extent. A full, impartial, critical history, based on research and trustworthy documents, would be of great service. It is a subject that can be treated as White has treated the St. Bartholomew, and afford a work that men of all schools of thought and belief could consult and recognize.

Rule had the opportunity of rendering a real service to historic truth, but he is utterly devoid of the qualifications for the task he has undertaken. He has not even the tact to hide his blind fanaticism and put on the semblance of impartiality. Passages like these show the temper of his mind: "If Romanism were Christianity and not idolatry" (vol. 1, p. 145 n.). "Drunken with the blood of the saints and martyrs of Jesus, popery raged in this age" (p. 236); "murderous police" (*i. e.*, the Jesuits), (p. 288).

His historical accuracy may be seen in vol. 2, pp. 208–9, where he says: "About this time," A. D. 1570, "the Bartholomew massacre was contrived partly at Rome, during a visit of the Cardinal of Lorraine, and partly by the instigation of the Inquisition at Madrid." It will be enough to refer to White's St. Bartholomew, a Protestant work, reprinted in this country by the Harpers, to show that there is not the trace of a foundation for this charge, or for implicating the Church at all in the design. Then, too, p. 209, he makes Pius V. celebrate it with public rejoicings, when that Pope was actually dead.

His theological knowledge may be conjectured from his note (vol. 1, p. 290), where, speaking of Scio, the Spanish translator of the New Testament, he says: "But he could not obliterate the false readings of the modern Vulgate," and in his second volume, Appendix, p. 329, heads "Inquisitorial Ignorance," a passage from Archbishop Sotomayor. If he knows anything of the Biblical studies of the century he must know that the collation of ancient Greek manuscripts has made the received Greek text, which Protestants have blindly followed, utterly untenable, and has so substantiated the accuracy of the Vulgate as representing a still earlier class of manuscripts, that Protestants must now, if they retain the woman taken in adultery, retain it on the authority of the Vulgate.

Speaking of Borri, Rule says: "He taught that the Blessed Virgin was born of St. Ann in the same manner as Jesus Christ our Lord was born of Mary. He called her the only daughter of God, conceived by the Holy Ghost;" then he adds in a note: "The reader needs not to be reminded that *this* idle and unscriptural figment under the management of Pius IX. is now made . . . . an article of faith." It is impossible to conceive ignorance or bad faith greater than this. The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, as a moment's reading would show him, is that Mary from her conception, like Eve before the fall, was free from the original sin, and that neither in the Decree nor elsewhere is her conception held to be an exception to the ordinary rule of nature. In fact Catholics, knowing both her father and her mother, profess it distinctly.

What his own religious views are, apart from a most unreasoning hatred of Catholicity, it is not easy to define. He treats the conversion of Jews to Catholicity as apostasy (vol. 1, p. 145), and justifies it in a note. He cannot, therefore, believe faith in Jesus Christ as the Messias necessary for salvation. In fact he seems to exclude this and all other doctrines held by the Catholic Church, and must consider such of them as are held by the Protestant sects in common as unnecessary for salvation. As we have seen, he holds that a man with an enlightened conscience may swear to the reverse of truth. He justifies those countrymen of his who attacked priests

at the altar or in procession as "filled with that horror and indignation which they only can conceive who have felt the same, as if they had passed into a region of blasphemy, where the people were in open revolt against the majesty of heaven."

Finding that bigamy was punished by the Inquisition, he makes the Church responsible for not having banished bigamy from earth; as though Luther had not justified it, and our country, Protestant in its tone, legalized it by its lavishly granted divorces, so relaxing the marriage tie that Mormonism, with polygamy as a doctrine, is firmly fastened on the land.

It may be said that it is impossible for a Protestant to read the atrocities of the Inquisition, and write calmly. White wrote his *History of St. Bartholomew* without being led into ignorance or uncriticalness by the cruelty of the act to his fellow-believers. Challoner in his *Missionary Priests*, and O'Reilly in his *Memorials* of those who suffered for the Catholic faith in Ireland, have given the lives of those Catholic priests and laymen put to death for their faith, in England and Ireland, without any such violence of language or thought as characterizes Rule. With a field that he might have made peculiarly his own by accurate scholarly research, Rule unfortunately brought to his task a blind religious hate, vagueness of religious views, great ignorance of Catholic doctrine, and a partial, uncritical, credulous mind.

As we have seen, he follows for the Spanish Inquisition the work of Llorente, repeating his errors without examination, even where Protestant writers had called attention to them. With Limborch it is the same. He makes no attempt to sustain these authors by citing passages in full, by documents, or by contemporaneous annals, the only way in which a history can be properly written. He takes Llorente's wild system of figures, perverting some general statement so as to limit it in time and space, then multiplying indefinitely to get figures for the whole kingdom. He ignores the numbers punished by the Inquisition for crimes against nature, bigamy, witchcraft, and the like, and swells out the numbers to hundreds of thousands by his enormous numbers of penitents.

Where he has not Llorente to follow, his account is vague and unsatisfactory. He is constantly appealing to imagination, thus; "We find everywhere stated that public executions were no less frequent in Portugal than in Spain, but we do not find authentic matter for a true sketch."

The mild form of the Inquisition in Italy he eludes, and the efforts of the sovereign pontiffs and of the Jesuits to mitigate the rigors of the tribunal in Spain and Portugal are never fairly stated; and what is reluctantly said is weakened at once, by insinuations and imputations of bad faith.

A person may read the work from first to last without finding the question of religious coercion distinctly treated; without finding an admission that Protestant countries punished with death and minor punishments as well Catholics who refused to enter the Protestant State Church as dissenters who wished to leave it. For a century and a half after the revolt of Luther, punishment for disagreeing with the state established Church was universal; it was the rule in England and Germany as in Spain or Italy. After that period, as men grew less in earnest in their religious views, the severity was relaxed. Indifferentism gave place largely in the last century to infidelity, and the spirit of the governments of the nineteenth century is one that ignores God. With the fall of Rome the Inquisition even in name ceased to be an institution in any way connected with the Church. Religious coercion is no longer her act; but it exists, and governments, whether Russo-Greek, Lutheran, Anglican, Liberal, or simply Masonic, claim the right to coerce; they no longer attempt the hopeless task of crushing Catholicity by force; they claim the right to regulate her faith, her worship, her hierarchy, the instruction of her laity, her rules of membership, and punish all opposition to their strange wild usurpation by fines, imprisonment, and Siberian horrors. The real Inquisition of this age, is the war of Czar, Kaiser, Commune, and Republic, against the Catholic Church, which they honor with their hate, as being the only real representative of the religious idea.

It is, therefore, to be deeply regretted that our times should produce such a shallow, pretentious work on a subject upon which a really critical and honest book is needed, the subject of religious coercion by the civil power.

SECULAR EDUCATION IN ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES.

De l'Éducation. Par Mgr. Dupanloup, Évêque d'Orléans.
La Liberté de l'Enseignement Supérieur. Par Mgr. Dupanloup.
Public Education in the United States. By Hugh Seymour Tremenheere.
Thoughts selected from the Writings of Horace Mann, Secretary of the Massachusetts Education Board.

NOBODY reproaches a tree because it sends its branches into the air and its roots into the ground. In doing so it only obeys a natural law. When the Church claims the right to teach her own children she does the same thing. She is a mother, and loves her own, as mothers are apt to do. They need her care, and would perish without it. For this end she was created, that she might secure victory to her children in their conflict with the world and the devil. That is the purpose for which she exists. And she fulfils it chiefly by *teaching* them. When the world says to her, as it begins to do in our day, "Give me your children to educate," it invites her to commit suicide. It might as well say to her, "Cease to exist." But that is a matter in which she has no liberty of choice. She *must* exist. She is not a fabric of human art, much less a product of spontaneous generation, but owes her being to the creative *fiat* of the Almighty. And as she is not the author of her own life, she has no power to lay it down, even if she had the wish. It is her destiny to endure "till the consummation of all things." God will have it so. *Fundavit eam in æternum.* Her children have never known, and never will know, any anxiety on that point; because her Divine Founder, whose word is truth, has said, that no power of earth or hell, separately or in combination, "shall prevail against her." Both men and demons have done what they could, and have given her a troubled life; but even her impenitent adversaries understand, and confess with despair, that they are doomed to perpetual defeat, and she to eternal victory. "When we reflect," said Macaulay, "on the tremendous assaults which she has survived, we find it difficult to conceive in what way she is to perish."

The special function of the Church is to teach: "Go, *teach* all nations." She has, indeed, other duties towards the children of men; being, as St. Paul says, the "dispenser of the mysteries of God," and the sole channel through which the most precious gifts of the Creator are distributed to the creature. "They have not

God for a father," was the language of the saints, "who have not the Church for a mother." But it is on the vigilance with which she discharges her *teaching office* that her life and theirs mainly depend. Vast as is the power delegated to her by her Founder, and the might which comes from her inseparable union with Him, it is with an infirm and unstable race that she has to deal, and she cannot change the conditions of her warfare. She has to protect the weak against the strong, human simplicity against diabolical craft. If her vigilance were not unsleeping, a combat so unequal could have only one issue. Only supernatural armor can resist the deadly thrust which easily pierces through all human defences. The son of Jesse might refuse to wear a coat of mail, but it was because the sling and the stone with which he went to battle were weapons which the Lord of Hosts had lent him. If "the God of the armies of Israel" had so willed it, he could have strangled the Philistine with a silken thread. There is no might nor strength against God. But if we would be invulnerable like David, we must be, as he was, in alliance with God. The God of David enters into covenant with no man except through His Church. "*Deus extra Ecclesiam*," said St. Anselm, "*inveniri non potest.*" And therefore the Church gives her hand to us at the baptismal font, and from that hour, like a guardian angel, guides our steps, lifting us over every pitfall, driving from our path every seen enemy, and baffling those who are unseen. Woe to us if we go forth to battle without her! It will not be long before the Philistine has his foot on our neck. There is no satanical artifice so transparent, and none so effective, as that which tempts human imbecility to mortal combat without the only ally who can give it even a chance of victory. Yet in our own day the weakest member of the "diabolical trinity" has made an insane compact with the strongest, of which we begin, in more than one land, to see the fruits. "Your fundamental mistake," says the devil to the world, "is allowing the Church to educate your children." "Very true," replies the idiotic world, "but it is not too late to correct the mistake, especially with your valuable co-operation." The result of this conference between the two unequal but sympathetic potentates is a combined resolve to throttle the human race, or as much of it as they can contrive to grasp, with "*secular education.*"

The project is not entirely new, for Julian tried it, not without a certain momentary appearance of success; but God took the apostate away, and the Church went on teaching. "The Christian Church," says Guizot, "saved Christianity." If the world could be induced to reason about such matters, we should ask it what it proposes to gain, even according to its own estimate of gain, by its latest bargain with Satan? But, as the gentle Fénélon said, "the

world has still more need of reason than of faith." If it would reason first, it might end by believing. Let it consider, for example, if it desires to impart even a semblance of reason to its own chaotic proceedings, or to suggest a plausible justification of them, on what grounds it contests the right of the Church to educate her own children, and what are at this hour the ascertained results of attempting to supersede her in that function? The only reason which secularists have ever alleged is demonstrably, as far as the Church is concerned, no reason at all. People are so divided, they say, in their religious opinions, and their differences so envenomed and irreconcilable, that our only chance of making education universal is by altogether excluding religion from our programme. This may be an impressive argument as respects those who do *not* belong to the Church, but how does it apply, however remotely, to those who do? Why should two-thirds of all the Christians in the world, who abide in unity and are subject to authority, be violently mulcted of their most sacred rights and reduced to spiritual famine, because the other third, who are outside the Church, find it easier to suppress religion altogether than to hold the same opinions about it? Cannot sectaries reap what they have sown without obliging Catholics to share their poisoned diet with them? There is only one answer to this question. It is furnished by a candid American Protestant. "Secularism is not religious *neutrality*," he observes, "but public atheism, the most intolerant and oppressive of all sectarianisms that have prevailed on earth."[1] It is intolerable both to the secularist and the sectary that any one should believe more than he does; and as he finds, to his extreme mortification, that what *he* calls reason has no power to quench faith, and what he calls science quite as little, he goes to Parliament, or Congress, or Reichsrath, and says, with a forehead of brass and a face which knows not how to blush: "Oblige me by putting down Christian teachers by force, and count upon my vote and that of my friends to make it worth your while." As all the governments of our day are officially atheistic—except, perhaps, that of Ecuador—and legislate as if there was no God, or none of whom they need take account, they reply: "Prove that your votes outnumber those of the Christians, and we are entirely at your service." The whole science of government, as practiced in the nineteenth century, is epitomized in that response.

Is it unreasonable in Christians to desiderate in a matter of such tremendous gravity,—affecting not only the future destiny, but even the present fortunes of human society,—a little less of brute force, and a little more of rational argument? We are open to convic-

[1] Things Sacred and Secular in American Life, p. 16.

tion; and if the secularist can prove either that the Church has not the power, or has lost it, or has not the will, and is not likely to have it, to educate her own children, and make them good citizens as well as good Christians, we will endeavor to accept School Boards, if not with enthusiasm, at least with resignation. On that hypothesis, the final ruin of modern society may as well be accomplished by secular education as by anything else. If we must be buried, we are not particular about the dimensions of our tomb, the shape of the coffin, or the color of the pall. Let the worms who will feed on us dispute about that. But is it *true* that the Church has lost either the power or the will to do what the Most High appointed her to do? That she had both once, and not long ago, nobody disputes. As late as the seventeenth century, one of the giant intellects of that age confessed her schools were the best ever seen on earth! Bacon, to whom men ascribe the glory of proposing the true method of cultivating science, ought to be an authority with all who quote him in that character. Aristotle was not more truly the father of inductive philosophy, according to contemporary critics, than Bacon of scientific investigation. We might, perhaps, dispute the statement, but have no present motive for doing so. We are content to invite materialists and secularists to listen to their own oracle. "As to the art of instructing youth," said Bacon, "the shortest method would be to say, *consult the schools of the Jesuits;* for, among all that have hitherto existed, there is nothing better."[1] The immense and incontestable superiority of the Catholic schools more than a century after the pretended Reformation was so notorious that Mr. Buckle finds in it the explanation of the famous antithesis of Macaulay: "Fifty years after the Lutheran separation, Catholicism could scarcely maintain itself on the shores of the Mediterranean; a hundred years after the separation, Protestantism could scarcely maintain itself on the shores of the Baltic." "The Protestant clergy," says Mr. Buckle, "destroyed the possibility of free inquiry, and, so far as they were able, put a stop to the acquisition of all real knowledge." They ordered their Synods to "have a watchful eye over those ministers who study chemistry"—what would they have said to the Jesuit missionaries who, as Humboldt remarked, recorded their observations on terrestrial magnetism?—"and grievously reprove and censure them." The result was that many Protestants, "seeing that under such a system it was impossible to educate their families with advantage, sent their children to some of those celebrated Catholic colleges, *where alone a sound education could then be*

[1] "Ad pædagogicam quod attinet, brevissimum foret dictu: Consule scholas Jesuitarum. Nihil enim, quod in usum venit, his melius."—De Augmentis Scientiarum, lib. vi., cap. 4, p. 341. Argentorati, 1635.

obtained."[1] The contrast between the schools of the Church and those of the sects was so fundamental, that a French writer says of one of the Protestant communities of his land: "S'ils avaient vaincu, la France était perdue pour la vraie civilisation."[2]

But there was nothing new in this unwearied zeal of the Church to impart education, and to do it by the most consummate methods which genius had suggested or keen observation devised. Long ages before Bacon and other Protestant writers had attested her enormous superiority as a teacher in every branch of human knowledge over all her lagging and distanced rivals, she was founding in every part of Europe, and notably in Great Britain, those famous universities which the German Huber frankly styles "a bequest from Catholic to Protestant England." "As early as the *ninth* century," he says, in the very darkest of the so-called dark ages, "Oxford was the seat of a school of the highest intellectual cultivation then existing." The Church did not wait for any impulse from "modern thought" or "modern civilization"—cant words which feebly veil the penury of the one and the degradation of the other—to enforce the principle upon which she has always acted, that the only limit of attainable knowledge is the limit of opportunity. "Most of the Continental universities," continues the Protestant Huber, "originated in entire dependence on the Church," and "her mode of exercising so important a trust is marked by an honorable activity." Nay, more: "The new intellectual impulse sprang up, not only on the domain and under the guidance of the Church, *but out of ecclesiastical schools.*" And the great central authority, to which all Christendom was then happily subject, lent all its energy and influence to sustain this intellectual movement. "From the beginning of the eleventh century," we are still quoting Huber, "the papal bulls and briefs took notes of the most minute details of management, even *superintending* the schools, as far as the age permitted."[3] If the Church were really indifferent or hostile to cultivation of mind and the progress of knowledge, as her mendacious detractors affect to believe, her apathy had a curious resemblance to zeal, her repugnance to sympathy, and her hatred to love. She disguised her imaginary aversion to intellectual life with such complete success that even the prejudiced Huber sees only a mournful *contrast* between the present and the earlier condition of our own universities! "There is no question," he says, "that during the Middle Ages the English universities were distinguished *far more*

[1] Buckle's History of Civilization in England, vol. 1, ch. 9, p. 587, 3d edition.

[2] Services que le Catholicisme a rendus à la France, par M. C. Vte. le Gazan, p. 43.

[3] Many examples will be found in the Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ of Wilkins, showing the intimate relations between Oxford and the Holy See, and the confidence felt by the one in the protection of the other.

than ever afterwards by energy and variety of intellect." Such a witness deserves to be heard to the end. He is speaking, let it be observed, of a time when the Holy Apostolic See, which saints and councils called "The Chair of the most blessed Peter," was the supreme arbiter in all human affairs, as God designed it to be, and its authority an essential part of the public law of Europe. The Church was then free, as she had never been before, to mould human society according to her own maxims, and to take the initiative in the whole wide field of thought and conscience, and in all that could contribute to the orderly progress of Christian communities. There were none to accuse and none to instruct her. Her action was spontaneous and unfettered; for she was truly, as Isaias predicted, Queen of the Nations. And how did she use the sovereignty which none disputed? Now is the time to judge her, when she was the beneficent mistress of a world which she had herself civilized. "Later times," is the candid answer of Huber to this capital question, "cannot produce a concentration of men eminent in all the learning and science of the age, *such as Oxford and Cambridge then poured forth*, mightily influencing the intellectual development of all Western Christendom." And it was the very men—let our shameless and ungrateful generation mark the fact—who were most completely identified with the Church, who felt with her heart and thought with her mind, who were the most active and untiring agents both in stimulating the thirst for knowledge, and in satisfying the desire which their own contagious example had created. It was from the sacred cloisters and peaceful monasteries of the Church that the vast host of students of that age, allured by no sordid motive and attracted by no temporal advantage, received both the invitation to aspire to learning, and the direction, equally patient and acute, of the labors to which they were nobly encouraged. It is an emphatic rebuke, says Huber, to the ignorant and sordid libellers of our own age, who can only sneer at what they do not understand, that "most of these worthies were *monks* of the Benedictine, Franciscan, Dominican, Carmelite, or reformed Augustinian order." It was no languid or intermittent effort which these laborious monks inspired, but a sustained and generous enthusiasm. "In consequence of this surpassing celebrity Oxford became the focus of a prodigious congregation of students,"—amounting in the thirteenth century to thirty thousand! And this amazing concourse, which, as he observes, "eminently testifies intellectual activity in the nation and times," was the more significant of the real character of that triumphal age of the Church, "since the University was as yet very poor, *and had no outward attractions to offer.*"[1] And it was the same

[1] Huber, The English Universities, vol. 1, pp. 13, 17, 43, 65, 66; ed. Francis Newman.

in Scotland as in England. "It ought not to be forgotten," said the late James Forbes, "that it is to the Mediæval Church that we are indebted for our universities. Three out of the four universities of Scotland had Catholic bishops for their founders."[1]

It would carry us too far if we were to attempt to illustrate by example the vigorous intelligence and supreme good sense of those "monastic missionaries," who, as Montalembert remarks, "were in reality the most direct agents, the most immediate envoys from the Holy See, that had been yet seen in Christendom;" and who, while they exhorted our forefathers to liberal studies, taught them "*self-government*, that is to say, the proud independence of the free man among his fellows in the general commonwealth," and made them at the same time, "a nation of Christians more fervent, more liberal, more docile and attached to the Church, more fruitful in saintly men and women, than any other contemporary nation."[2] But, if we have no space for such details, we ask permission to give a single specimen, taken from a very early age, of the sagacity and true enlightenment of the old English monks. St. Aldhelm, who in the *seventh* century was able to write both Latin and Greek, though perhaps not the Latin of Cicero nor the Greek of Thucydides, and who was buried with all honor and reverence by St. Dunstan himself, the noble successor of St. Odo, displays in the following remark the acuteness which even the empirical critics of our day, whose "superficial omniscience" would have provoked a kind of jovial disgust in the philosophic saints whom they generally despise, will perhaps consent to applaud. "Apocryphorum enim nænias," said this recluse of the seventh century, "et incertas frivolorum fabulas, nequaquam Catholica receptat Ecclesia."[3] We should like to give other examples of monkish criticism in these remote ages, but the seductive temptation must be resisted. "Modern thought" does not seem to us to have supplied their places, or to be likely to do so. When faith disappears, everything else goes with it; for faith, as St. Augustine said, is "a condition of knowledge," as well as of all true nobility. Proofs are not wanting. The Church of God had enriched England with seminaries of learning, which were at the same time schools of exalted piety; under the withering influence of the new national sect they quickly ceased to be either. In the time of Edward VI., to quote Huber once more, "the universities were made essentially Protestant, ... and every academician whose conscience forbade him to renounce Catholicism was ejected. Anthony Wood relates that in Oxford fourteen heads of colleges and nearly ninety fellows were expelled, and among

[1] Life of James David Forbes, F.R.S., p. 394.
[2] Monks of the West, vol. 5, p. 184.
[3] St. Aldhelm. De laudibus Virginitatis, Migne.

these were some of the most learned men." The effect was immediate, and by the reign of Elizabeth "the most trustworthy evidence sets it beyond all doubt that intellectual quite as much as moral and religious interests at the universities were at so low an ebb as not to compare with far less favored periods." As to the academical students, few in number compared with the host who flocked thither in Catholic times, "their morals and sentiments are described at the same time as having been in the highest degree wild, selfish, loose, devoid of all earnestness, honor, or piety." The "Catholic bequest to Protestant England" had been in a few years so effectually squandered that, according to the decisive testimony of Anthony Wood, "in Oxford itself you have to search after the Oxford University, so greatly has everything changed for the worse."[1] In our day, to complete the history, while a few become conversant with classical learning for the sake of the pecuniary or social advancement attached to proficiency, the Protestant bishop of Oxford has lately announced that, owing to the growing unbelief of the teaching body, he can only admit fellows of colleges to the ministry with extreme precaution.

Such is the contrast between the work of the Church and the work of the sects. From the seventh to the seventeenth centuries, by the unsuspicious evidence of Bacon and Huber, the Church was at once the most zealous and the most efficient teacher, both of divine and human learning. She made in the same hour scholars and saints. "A sure and unbroken progress of intellectual culture," says the Protestant Ranke, "had been going on within its bosom for a series of ages; all the vital and productive elements of human culture were here united and mingled."[2] If, then, the Church, as certain sciolists of our day assure us, has renounced her glorious past; abdicated, whether from exhaustion or a sense of incapacity, her teaching office; and resolved, for the first time in her long history, to oppose the progress of true knowledge and discountenance mental culture; we should like to ask, without expecting any reply, what intelligible token she has given of these new dispositions? Wherever she is least fettered in her action, as in England, France, Holland, Ireland, Canada, and the United States, she is busily founding new educational institutions. In the direction of these colleges and universities, for which she desires a constantly wider extension, her bishops, never more worthy of their apostolic office, everywhere invite the co-operation of the highest available talent. Not a question of science, philosophy, history, literature, or art, is proscribed.

---

[1] Huber, pp. 307, 326.

[2] History of the Reformation in Germany, by Leopold von Ranke; vol. 1, book ii, ch. 1, p. 251, ed. Austin.

Every truth is welcome, because every truth is sacred.[1] Without endowments, of which she has been despoiled, she combats enemies whose resources, at least in the Old World, are mainly derived from her own rifled treasury. In every arena of fair competition, it is not her children who occupy the lowest place. A single supernatural virtue is, indeed, more precious in her judgment, than a hundred triumphs of unconsecrated art or a thousand efforts of unhallowed genius; but she is now, as ever, the home of the highest forms of the one, the source of the noblest products of the other. We see no change in her, either in her testimony to revealed truth or her attitude towards the development of human knowledge. In both she remains unalterably the same. Why, then, should she cease to teach the world now, who for so many ages was its *only* teacher? Has she lost her gift? Has He, who gave, transferred it to other hands? Let those who claim to supersede her produce their diploma. If He, who is "without variableness or shadow of change," has divorced His long-cherished spouse, and plucked from her brow the nuptial crown, by what apocryphal court was the decree pronounced, and in what fantastic register shall we find it recorded?

There is little wisdom in proposing bootless questions, to which no reply can be given. It is not the Church, even her enemies admit, who has changed, being constitutionally incapable of meriting that flattering reproach; but the progress of "science" has abolished the supernatural, refuted revelation, and reduced the Bible to the level of an oriental fable. There are people who profess to believe that. If we asked them *which* established truth of science is in formal contradiction with which truth of revelation, we doubt if they would tell us. It is less compromising to say, in vague and general terms, that faith and science are irreconcilable. This formula is at once more imposing and more elastic. It is also, which is perhaps an additional merit, totally and absurdly untrue. The *truths* of science are one thing; its guesses, peradventures, and crude hypotheses are another. It is only the latter which ever did, or ever will, conflict with faith. One truth cannot contradict another; and our self-complacent scientists are not ignorant of the notorious fact that, even in the recent times, the great *discoverers* in the field of science, who have really added to the sum of human knowledge, have all been earnest believers in revelation. "Ask," says Mgr. Dupanloup, "all the great men of the seventeenth century, Leibnitz, Kepler, Newton, Bacon, Descartes, Pascal, who were the fathers of the modern sciences, if faith repudiates science."[2] Ask in our own day, he adds, Ampère, Biot, Cauchy, with whom we may name

[1] "Si la vérité est Dieu même, il s'ensuit, comme parle St. Augustin, *que toute science est bonne en soi.*"—Ozanam, Œuvres Choisies, p. 312, 1859.

[2] La Liberté de l'Enseignement Supérieur, p. 23.

Brewster, Whewell, Forbes, Faraday, and Owen. Of Forbes, who was chiefly occupied with physical science, his biographer says: "His scientific habits of thought never disturbed or cast the shadow of a doubt over his faith."[1] It is, in fact, only men of an inferior grade, both morally and intellectually, who would have been equally impious if they had been wholly ignorant of science, who pretend that there is any real conflict between truths of the natural and the supernatural order. "If you say that we are enemies of science," continues Mgr. Dupanloup, "give us back our professional chairs, and we will show you that the genius of Christian *savants* is not an extinguished flame. But you insult us with impunity, while you refuse to untie our hands."

These noble words of the Bishop of Orleans, who has so little respect for ignorance that he has taught his own seminarists to act the plays of Sophocles and Euripides, bring us to the grave topic to which what has been said thus far is only introductory, and reveal the true motive of those pretended votaries of science who wish to expel the Church of God from all share in the work of public education. They are really solicitous—not like Kepler, Leibnitz, and Newton, about truth—but only about their own cynical theories and profane assumptions. Their strongest passion is not love of science, but hatred of religion. This is what Professor Huxley and his school have in view when he says, with petulant insolence and superb contempt of facts, "the Roman Catholic Church is the one great spiritual organization which is able to resist, and must as a matter of life and death resist, the progress of science and modern civilization."[2] He wants that "nucleated mass of protoplasm" which is called man, and which one of his own sort defined not long ago as "a sarcoidous peripatetic fungus,"—unfortunate biped, what will they make of him next!—to be free to think and say whatever he pleases, without being subject to the vexatious admonitions of the Church. To be maintained always in the harmony of truth is an odious limitation of liberty! What is the use of being free, if one is not free to err? Happy they who understand that such freedom is the worst kind of slavery, and devoutly bless God who is able to keep them from the horrors of such ignominious bondage. The Church, by His sovereign decree, is the witness and guardian of a certain fixed deposit of revealed truth; and, though she has no special lights about magnetism, chemistry, or biology, she has an infallible test by which she can try each of them, and every other human science. Starting from the principle that one truth cannot contradict another, and that the truths of faith, as even Sir William

---

[1] Life, p. 453.

[2] Huxley, Lay Sermons, IV, 61.

Hamilton confessed, are more certain than the truths of sense,[1] because they are never chimeras and rest on a more solid foundation, she arrives at the eminently rational conclusion, that when the doubtful and fluctuating presumes to dictate to the positive and permanent, when the human tries to soar with unsteady wing above the divine, when the nebulous dream of every conceited pedant usurps the function and parodies the authority of all the Prophets and all the Apostles, there is no argument in all this against the salutary interposition of the Church, but rather against the inconceivable folly of those who resent its action and forfeit its help, only to commit that mental ἐξαγωγή which is the form of suicide most prevalent in our age.

Among the possible eccentricities of "modern thought" there is one which we have not yet encountered. We never met a man, even in the ranks of the most "advanced thinkers," who contended that in the acquisition of a foreign language the use of a grammar and dictionary is a fatal impediment. Yet this would be a rational proposition compared with the delirious popular notion, that the authority which God has given to His Church is adverse to mental freedom. It is, in fact, and was designed to be, its sure defence. It is God's own provision against the aberrations of human reason. If truths of every order were simply axiomatic, and the rational faculty wholly exempt from error, instead of being, as Kant maintains in his essay on *Pure Reason*, "liable to an inevitable delusion," we might evidently dispense with guides and teachers. But this delusion finds so little acceptance, even in our puerile generation, that it is only in the sphere of *spiritual* truths that men claim to ignore authority. Writers like Professor Bain and Sir George Cornwall Lewis concur in the assertion, that "between Authority and Reason there is no opposition;"[2] and the airy pontiffs of materialism exact from their disciples a submission not less complete than the Church, with better reason, claims from hers. They have no invincible antipathy to popes, provided they grasp the keys and don the tiara themselves. The essential difference between them is, that the one defends the rights of truth, the other the privileges of error. In the Church now, as in all former ages, every speculation is legitimate, in every sphere of thought, subject to this sole restriction, that no conclusion can be admitted which contradicts a revealed truth previously established, and resting upon a fixed and immovable foundation. It is this fruitful and salutary postulate which encourages in Catholics the *widest liberty of thought*, because

[1] Hamilton does not scruple to say that "knowledge is an inferior ground of assurance to natural belief," a statement quoted by the late J. S. Mill with extreme disapprobation.

[2] Influence of Authority in Matters of Opinion, ch. iii, p. 64.

it supplies a certain guarantee against its errors and excesses. In the middle ages, when the authority of the Church was supreme in every Christian conscience and dominated every enlightened intellect, there was a riot of speculation *de omni re scibili*. Huber thinks he perceives "an essential similarity between the general movement of mind in the present nineteenth century and that in the *twelfth*;" and adds, that "the Church met the new speculative tendency not altogether in hostility," while "for whatever of the old studies survived, the merit is hers."[1] When a man impudently contends in our day, like Earl Russell and his echo, Mr. Gladstone, that the Church stifles mental freedom, he only proves that dull bigotry has destroyed his own, and contradicts the whole history of human thought. Her office is to secure freedom by truth, which she alone has the power to do, because she alone possesses the eternal copyright of that grammar and dictionary which give the only clue to the divine language of revelation, and the rules by which it is to be interpreted.

And precisely for this reason, as Ranke admits, the course of human thought was "a sure and unbroken *progress* for a series of ages," as long as the authority of the Church was respected. Since the great revolt of the sixteenth century, which "gave to every man," as Goethe said, "the right to judge all things, without giving him the power," the ephemeral products of what is still called "thought" are chiefly remarkable for the voracity with which they devour one another. The truth of to-day is the fable of to-morrow, and will be the jest of the day after. Nothing is stable, nothing permanent. Mists and shadows darken the earth, and realities have faded into night. Our spurious and combative philosophers, who are chiefly occupied in refuting each other, "after denying everything else," as a French ecclesiastical writer lately remarked, "have ended by denying themselves." It is the only service which they have ever rendered to humanity. Like the old pagans, who would have obeyed the authority of the Church if they had known it, their sterile discussions end in a cry of despair, and the last word of their impotent philosophy is the ludicrous confession that all that is worth knowing is unknowable. Hence the grand discovery of our age, by which it hopes to regain all which it has lost,—that religion must be divorced from education, and that the discrowned teacher of nations must be content to veil her face before the rising sun of parochial magnates and district school boards.

It is this discovery which we now propose to examine. We know what the Church has done for the world, and are curious to inquire what it designs to do for itself. If it should turn out that

[1] Huber, vol. I, pp. 5, 11.

a fundamental error of enormous dimensions lies at the root of the new scheme by which the world aspires to do the work of the Church, it may chance that before long people will be saying of it, in the words of Lord Bacon, "The misery is that the most effectual means are now applied *to the ends least to be desired.*"[1] Evidence in support of that view of the subject accumulates with frightful rapidity. Witnesses of the most opposite character and principles, and of various nationalities, concur in the opinion that the secular education craze is either a delusion or a crime, or both at once. That it is fruitless as a preventive against wickedness, and has not the remotest tendency to operate in that direction, even the prophets of the unknowable emphatically assert. "The time will come," says Mr. Huxley, "when Englishmen will quote our educational maxims as the stock example of the stolid stupidity of their ancestors in the nineteenth century;" and he adds, "If I am a knave or a fool, teaching me to read and write will not make me less of either one or the other."[2] "We have no evidence," observes Mr. Herbert Spencer, "that education, as commonly understood, is a preventive of crime." Facts look quite the other way; for, as he continues, "did much knowledge and piercing intelligence suffice to make men good, then Bacon should have been honest, and Napoleon should have been just."[3] In other words, secular education assumes as the only motive of human action one which is utterly powerless for good, and offers a remedy for human evils which can only augment them. Secular education no more tends to produce virtue in any man, either civic or religious, than teaching a dog to carry a parcel, or an ape to jump through a hoop. "*L'éducation et l'instruction,*" says the Bishop of Orleans, "sont deux choses profondement distinctes."[4] But that is an elementary truth which has no place in the meagre philosophy of School Boards. Even Professor Max Müller would tell them that "truth is not found by addition and multiplication only;"[5] a fact which does not easily penetrate the parochial mind. Suggest to our educational satraps, who are the scourge of rate-payers and the Nemesis of washer-women with large families, that something more is wanting, though it were only the θεῖόν τι of Aristotle, or the "divine inspiration" of Plato, and you will be like Ovid among the Thracians.

"Barbarus his ego, quia non intelligor illis."

Yet M. Thiers, whose free scope is not limited by any excessive respect for Christian maxims, once told the French Chamber, not

---

[1] Bacon's Essays, Civil and Moral. [2] Lay Sermons, iii, 38, 41.
[3] State Education Self-defeating, pp. 13, 15. [4] De l'Éducation, t. i, ch. iv, p. 180.
[5] Lectures on the Science of Language, p. 35.

simply that secular education is an unsubstantial bubble, but that no lay person can really *educate*—he did not say *instruct*—because "*il y faut du prêtre ou du réligieux.*" The most eminent of his countrymen, as Mgr. Dupanloup observes, have comprehended the absolute necessity of combining religion with education. Guizot said that education without religion "*is a danger for society.*" Cousin, who was careful to make his own peace with God and the Church before he died, did not fear to add: "It is the duty of families and of the clergy to combat any school where positive religious instruction is not given."[1]

"All that may be very true," reply our impenitent Secularists, "and if it is we shall probably find it out sooner or later; but what in the world are we to do? If you will quarrel so fiercely about religion, which has become the most active disintegrating force of our time, we have no alternative but to banish that element of combustion from our schools." The difficulty may be a real one, though it is none of ours; but who does not see that it is revolt against the Church which has introduced this new curse into the world? No one pretends that it ever had, or dreams that it ever will have, any place among Catholics. For them religion is not a fountain of strife, but a bond of supernatural union. "It is certain," said Lord Bacon, in whose writings we hardly expected to find such a sentiment, "that heresies and schisms are of all others the greatest scandals, yea, worse than corruption of manners."[2] This great thinker, who was an ardent supporter of the new Established Church, because his imperious royal mistress was its chief patron, did not consider that his very pert reflection came a little too late. That Church was founded on *the right of revolt*, and could not long refuse to others the agreeable privilege which it had used so largely itself. The example was contagious, and in a few years the *one* religion which had united all Englishmen for a thousand years had become a hundred. "It is true," said a famous Anglican at a later date, comparing his own raw sect with the Apostolic Church, "there were not so many schisms and divisions then as there are now; but the reason was," he plaintively adds, "*because the people did not make them*, as many do in our days, who notwithstanding that they are admitted into our Church, are so far from continuing steadfast in communion with it, that they never think they can separate themselves far enough from it."[3] Vain lament! Nobody listens to the sot preaching temperance, nor to the sectary whining about schism. Example in such cases is more potent than precept. "Let Anglicans cease to maunder about schism," said the philo-

---

[1] La Liberté de l'Enseignement Supérieur, p. 19.

[2] Essays, Civil and Moral. [3] Beveridge, Works, vol. ii, p. 437, 1843.

sophical *Spectator* not long ago, "or cease to be Anglicans." Secular education, as Bacon and Beveridge would perhaps admit if they lived now, with all its cohort of attendant evils, is one of the inevitable results of the so-called Reformation, which has pretty nearly annihilated religion in every country which accepted it, and is now going to extinguish the little that remains by a process which, after being matured in other lands, is at length being adopted in our own.

Holy Scripture says: "Surely in vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird." Not quite in vain! Let the astute bird-catcher keep *himself* out of sight, which he is crafty enough to do, and his net will soon be filled with birds of various plumage. We purpose to illustrate this fact in the natural history of bird-catching chiefly by the example of our kinsmen in the United States. They are an acute and observant people, at least in temporal matters, and see certain things very clearly, provided the range is not too great, and the objects looked at not too far from the ground. So many of them have been caught already in the net, where they lie fluttering in doleful captivity, that things in the air and in the heavens above have become quite invisible to them. But the same thing has happened in a good many other lands, the bird-catcher being everywhere diligent in his calling; and *State Education* in Europe has banished all the songsters from the sky quite as effectually as *Common Schools* in America. It is fair to our transatlantic friends to recognize this fact, if they can derive any consolation from it. They may possibly be gratified to learn, though we wish them purer joys, that a so-called education in which the Church has had no share has produced exactly the same fatal catastrophe in the older communities of France, Germany, and Russia, as in the modern American Union.

The State in France has long had the monopoly of higher education, because, since the foundation of the university and its affiliated institutions by the first Napoleon, every public career was closed to those who sought it from other hands; and Mgr. Dupanloup quotes the observation of M. Le Play, a former senator, who says of Paris, "There is no city in Europe in which corruption has attained the same intensity." Many years ago M. de Cormenin vainly warned his unreflecting countrymen that the State colleges and lyceums had become "*les portes de l'enfer.*" It is these nurseries of impiety in which God was ignored and the Church insulted, which have brought France to her present condition. They have destroyed in the chief cities manliness and even patriotism, made revolution permanent, government impossible, and quenched all fraternity but that of crime and sedition. They have deluged the land with an obscene literature, the scandal of our age, which scoffs

at marriage, condones adultery, and has retained of Christian morality, as a living Frenchman bitterly observed, only this cynical reversal of two of its maxims: "Hate your neighbor, and love your neighbor's wife." "Les lettres françaises," we are told, "ont pris un caractère de légèreté à mesure que l'étude de la religion a perdu de son importance; et l'on pourrait suivre les degrès de leur décadence, en suivant les progrès de l'impiété."[1] "Notre litérature," says the Père Caussette, in accounting for the prodigious calamities of his country, "est devenue la plus immorale de l'Europe actuelle."[2] That is what secular education has done for France. It is to the pupils of a system of public education divorced from religion, and for the most part as void of scholarship as they are of moral dignity, that France owes the malignant ulcer which is gnawing her entrails, and for which her material prosperity is the feeblest kind of compensation. And though a vigorous reaction has at length commenced, and the legislature, taught by intolerable evils, has just conceded to the Church the right of free instruction, in the hope that she may exorcise the unclean spirits who profited by her enforced silence to make France their prey, their incorrigible human confederates, gnashing their teeth at the approach of any deliverer *qui venit in nomine Domini*, still cry with one voice: "Leave us in the mire in which we love to wallow." The Bishop of Orleans quotes from the *Revue de Philosophie Positive*, this characteristic argument: "Observe what is taking place in Belgium. Education is there free or nearly so; the result of which is that the Catholic and religious universities absorb the whole of the youth of that country." Was ever impiety more frank, or tyranny more candid? The moment we give you freedom, these Secularists confess, you beat us out of the field. Therefore no freedom for you; you shall be impious like us, or you shall be nothing. We cannot compete with you in any condition of society in which liberty of the conscience and of the intellect is respected, because in the hearts of fathers and mothers, your voice ever finds a responsive echo; and therefore we invoke the God-State to suppress the instincts of human nature by force, to crush every aspiration of the soul which has no place in ours, to build up an impassable wall between Christians and their God, and to tolerate no right but that which *we* claim, because it is the only one we value,—the right to ruin ourselves and others.

In Germany, the Secularists have got all they asked for, and perhaps a little more. The only unpardonable crime in that country is to be a Christian. The nearest to it in malignity, if we may judge by the Falk code, is to wish to be one. It is liberty enough for

---

[1] De l'Étude des Lettres, ch. 5, p. 128.

[2] Dieu et les Malheurs de la France, p. 47. 1871.

Germans, as it is for Chinese, to believe as the State believes. If they prefer, as most of them do, to believe *nothing*, they may please themselves, but the range of their choice lies between those limits. For all who rashly stray into the forbidden domain beyond them there is prompt correction. To such as dare to serve God, as St. Boniface taught their German fathers to do, the Prussian Mandarin has these replies: to-day he says, "fine him;" to-morrow, "incarcerate him;" and the next day, "exile him." If you are a priest, as St. Paul was, you shall starve; and if you are a layman who presumes to feed the priest, you shall starve too. Holy and venerable prelates, dear to God and man, shall languish in German dungeons, because they say to the German Cæsar, as St. Anselm did to the English one: "I will not refuse obedience to the Vicar of Christ." To the furnace, shouts the Prussian rabble of unbelievers, with these obstinate malefactors, who are so senseless that, when they "hear the sound of the sackbut, and psaltery, and all kinds of music," they refuse to "adore the golden statue which the King Nabuchodonosor has set up." That is the way we arrange things in Prussia. How long it will last is quite another question. The Avenger bides his time. It is probable that before long these Prussian Babylonians will be "eating grass like an ox," that they may learn to "glorify the King of Heaven," and know that he "is able to abase them that walk in pride."[1] Meanwhile, jubilant Secularism, happily blended with discriminating "Culture-worship," is improving the work of his Church, which it has gagged and manacled, after this triumphant fashion. A competent witness, Dr. Krummacher, Court Chaplain at Potsdam, thus describes the neopaganism of Berlin, where he had charge of a large parish: "There is an almost total want of any interest in the Church, or connection with it, among the people, and of the population of half a million not more than thirty thousand attend public worship on Sunday, and those mostly women." In the work from which this is an extract, "the author speaks of the foundations of all morality being thoroughly corrupt and decayed, and faith, piety, respect for Divine and human authority *at an end*."[2] "We are ripe," said the Privy Councillor Eilers, many years ago, "for the coming of Antichrist;" and the rotten maturity advances every hour. Only the other day, the Berlin correspondent of the *Times*, though deeply enamored of the very principles which have wrought this hideous

[1] Daniel, iv: 34. "Dieu, comme l'homme, choisit ses verges parmi les éléments les plus bas de la création, parce qu'il est de la nature des verges d'être brisées quand elles ont servi. C'est ainsi que l'Allemagne, apres avoir contribue a la moralisation des autres par les excès de son immoralité même, en recevra le châtiment trop merite."—R. P. Caussette, *ubi supra*, p. 17.

[2] Saturday Review, October 28th, 1871.

ruin, gave a report of this relapse into worse than pagan barbarism, which, as the *Spectator* observed the next day, "is certainly one to excite very great reflection, both religious and political. The writer tells us that in Prussia, one-sixth of the Protestant benefices, on becoming vacant, will have to remain vacant for want of candidates; that while the population has been increasing, the number of Protestant theological students in the universities of Prussia has been rapidly diminishing, so that there were only 740 in all the eight Prussian universities in 1873, against 2203 in 1831." In other words, while the population has augmented by more than one-third, the candidates for the ministry have diminished by two-thirds. The same journal continues: "If neither the cultivated class care to teach religion, nor the uncultivated to learn it, the natural inference is that, for the time at least, there is likely to be a reign of the purest secularism among the Protestants of that part of Germany where such tendencies prevail." And this is not all. "As we have no belief at all," adds the *Spectator*, with admirable good sense, "in the possibility that there can be any permanent vacuum of religious belief in the mind of a great Western people, we should say that the ground for anxiety which this prospect holds out is not so much fear for the growth of simple worldliness and disbelief in the supernatural, as fear that *some strange and dangerous form of fanaticism* may take its place." After observing that among the acute and more or less educated unbelievers of America, Spiritualism, with its grotesque *diablerie*, "has run like a prairie fire," the *Spectator* concludes: "We should expect to see in Germany some very grim superstitions growing up as soon as the ground recently occupied by German Protestantism has been left fallow for a few years; and we should fear they would be superstitions of a kind likely to give great trouble, not only to the homes of the people, but to the government of the State." We shall presently see that this is exactly what is taking place in Russia, the recoil from human and official religions, and the contemptuous secularism which they engender, being attended everywhere by the same formidable results. Already the Prussian government is asking for new powers against the rising evil; and when it comes to a head, with brutal communism and rabid socialism in its train, the blinded statesmen of Germany will have to go in sorrowful procession to unbar their prison doors, and entreat the captive bishops and priests to come forth, to stay the ruin which they alone could have averted, by the tardy use of remedies which they alone can dispense.

But if liberty is dead and religion dying in Germany, a fate which Bossuet predicted for both in all non-Catholic lands, are not these trifling evils abundantly compensated by the delightful evidences of "culture" in its highly educated population? What evidences?

If there is a people in all Europe distinguished by a total absence of grace and refinement, of all that the French call "charm," and by a coarseness and vulgarity of aspect and manners only matched by their impiety, it is the people of North Germany. Julius Fröebel, though a German, comparing the uneducated Indian natives of Nicaragua, Chili, and Peru with the masses of his own countrymen, frankly confesses that, "in almost every respect," and especially in that dignity of carriage which only true religion gives, "they are superior to our German peasantry."[1] Mr. Henry Mayhew, in his work on *German Life and Manners*,[2] goes much further. Comparing "*the middle classes*" of Saxony, the cradle of the so-called Reformation and the nursery of scholars, with the inhabitants of the "darkest dens" of the most abject quarters of London, he reports that, both morally and socially, the latter rank the highest! With a candor which we hardly expect in an English writer, he adds, alluding to "the cant which is extremely consoling to the minds of English clergymen about the social benefits of the Reformation," "We can conscientiously aver that the Rhenish *Catholic* population is by many degrees less squalid and less beggarly in their appearance."[3] "It is precisely," says another capable observer, "in the tracts of country which are Catholic to the core, that the peasants are most prosperous;" and further, "In the Catholic half of Westphalia," for the same contrast is apparent in all the German provinces, "they are more like well-to-do farmers than like peasants, in the English sense of the word."[4] Such are the combined triumphs of Cæsarism and secularism in a country which has ceased to be Protestant without becoming Christian.

The people of Russia, naturally inclined towards religion, and once conspicuous by an inherent docility of character, might have rivalled the Irish in purity, faith, and unity, if they had remained, like them, in communion with God through the Apostolic See. Under the fatal influence of a purely national and political State Church, wholly severed from Christendom, they are split into a hundred sects, and have substituted, as M. de Bonald observed, a formal or frantic superstition for the faith of St. Methodius, and the practice of the ancient Oriental Church as represented by St. Basil, St. Cyril, St. Chrysostom, and St. Athanasius. It was the constant apprehension of those majestic doctors of the East, of whom the last three submitted their own affairs to the judgment of the Roman Pontiff, that only the supreme authority of the Holy See could keep a region so inclined to heresy in the true faith. As soon as that authority was denied, after being proclaimed by all the Eastern pa-

---

[1] Seven Years in Central America, ch. x, p. 585. [2] Vol. 1, p. 384.
[3] *Ubi supra.* [4] Quoted in the Dublin Review, October, 1872, p. 341.

triarchs in successive Œcumenical Councils, their worst fears were realized. The world has rarely seen such a monument of the withering effects of schism, as exists at this day in Russia. A hundred contemporary writers, German, French, and English, have described the present religious aspect of that land. Our space will only permit us to cite one, the latest in date, and a Protestant. His testimony will enable us to trace once more the effects of a so-called education not directed by the Church, to whom alone God has assigned the function of teacher of the nations.

"As education spreads," says our informant, "the sectaries multiply." He had good authority for the fact. "'I have never known a peasant learn to read,' said to me a parish priest, 'and think for himself, who did not fall away into dissent.'"[1] Yet it is certain that the ruling power in Russia, for which a fictitious religion is the instrument of an efficacious political unity, did not intend, in conceding to peasants the right of thinking, to promote this result. It is a delusion common to all non-Catholic leaders of men, to imagine that they can loose the spirit of revolt in one direction, and curb it in another. Vain dream! People who have been taught that it is their highest duty to rebel against the Church, are sure to learn, sooner or later, that it is their highest privilege to rebel against everything else. They are learning it so fast in Russia, that the savage measures of repression adopted by the late Czar Nicholas, who predicted that "Russia will perish by her religious divisions," have only accelerated the catastrophe which they were feebly designed to postpone. "The result of thirty years of savage persecution is, that the nonconformists are to-day more numerous, wealthy, concentrated, than they were on the day when Nicholas began his reign." Their formidable numbers are so respectfully estimated, that "already it is felt in governing circles that nothing can be safely done in Russia *unless these Old Believers like it.* Every new suggestion laid before the Council of Ministers is met, I have been told, by the query, 'What will the Old Believers say?'"[2] "Half the people, even now, are Old Believers, says a priest from Kem, more than three-fourths will be the moment we are free;" and Mr. Dixon adds from his own observation, confirmed by that of "a German who has lived in Russia for thirty years," that "the Old Believers *are the Russian people*, while the Orthodox Believers," who belong to the State Church, "are but a courtly, official, and monastic sect." And all the various sects, many of them holding opinions subversive of social order, who compose what is called the "Popular Church," "are as much the enemies of an official em-

---

[1] Free Russia, by William Hepworth Dixon, vol. 1, ch. 25, p. 267, 1870.

[2] Ib., ch. 27, p. 285.

pire as they are of an official church. . . . . They refuse to pray for Alexander as a true believer, and they fear he is dead to religion, and lost to God." And while these sects maintain every odious doctrine which heresy can devise or fanaticism propagate, they all profess to derive their religion from the Bible! "Except in some New England homesteads, I have never heard such floods of reference and quotation in my life."[1]

Thus far we have seen nothing to shake our conviction that the Church of God was a more successful educator of the people, both in the interests of religion and of the State, of individual sanctification and of collective well-being, than any of the human agencies, secularist or denominational, by which the world has attempted to supply her place. Her superiority is as visible now as it was in the Middle Ages, and will be to the end of time. How should it be otherwise? She alone has a mission from God and the gifts necessary for its effectual accomplishment. She teaches *one* religion, not a hundred, and always teaches the same; and she makes loyalty to the civil power in its own sphere, whether monarchical or democratic, not a sentiment, a legend, or a caprice, but a sacred religious obligation. It is not her children who subvert states and plot conspiracies. "When you pretend," says the eloquent Bishop of Orleans, "that the Church speaks only for herself,—which you all do, whoever you are, if you profess any doctrine at all,—you forget to add that for the last 1800 years the Church lives and adapts herself, over the whole surface of the globe, and at this hour in the United States as in France, to all political systems constructed by the hand of man. She discharges her mission, defends her just rights, accomplishes her duties, and leaves sovereigns and peoples to arrange as they please their ephemeral constitutions. She is the adversary of nothing but iniquity and oppression."[2] And for this reason, making the law of God her sole rule and guide, and having no aim or purpose but the temporal and eternal welfare of the human race, her instructions tend as directly to civil tranquillity and the stability of states as to the increase of virtue and the perpetuity of the faith. How is it with her human substitutes? In replying to this question our last example shall be taken from the American Union.

There is nothing in which the least reflecting portion of the American public fancy they see more reason for exuberant national self-complacency than their system of *Common Schools.* The opinion is not shared by those, whether Americans or Europeans, who retain the admissible conviction, for which there is a good deal to be said, that man is not a machine, nor eternity a fable.

[1] Free Russia, ch. 33, p. 348; ch. 28, p. 313.

[2] La Liberté de l'Ensignement Supérieur, p. 9.

Even they, who deprecate any revision of the huge code of Secularism which Americans have made a kind of national gospel, plead, with rare exceptions, that it is not *designed* to exclude religious instruction, which is properly a domestic affair, and is sufficiently provided for in Sunday-schools. That is the sole argument by which the existing system is or can be defended, except by those who deny the immortality of the soul. But "this means," as an intelligent interpreter of American opinion observes, "that thirty hours a week ought to be given to the dictionary and the multiplication table, and one hour to the catechism and the ten commandments." It assumes, that is, that their relative importance is as thirty to one; which is substantially equivalent to the proposition that religion is the least remunerative topic which can engage the attention of man. "Send your children to schools all the week where they will hear nothing whatever of religion, where that most vital of all concerns will be *a forbidden subject*, where the idea will be practically, if not in so many words, impressed upon their tender minds that it is of no consequence whether they are Christians, or Jews, or infidels, so long as they master the various branches of worldly knowledge which promote success in the secular affairs of life; and then get them into the Sunday-school, if you can, for a wild and ineffectual attempt to counteract the evil tendencies of the previous six days' teaching."[1] No one, we think, will be surprised to hear that even this feeble remedy, which would be inadequate, if it were applied over the whole surface of the country, is, in too many cases, not applied at all. "The *theory*," says M. Tremenheere, "on which the whole public school system of the United States is based is, that the religious instruction which is not given in the day-school is given in the Sunday-school;" and he adds, from personal observation, and the testimony of capable witnesses, that this theory "*is not carried out in practice.*" The most ardent advocates of Secularism admit that it *ought* to be, and that without this corrective agency the system would be self-condemned; but M. Tremenheere assures us, that "the theory of a complete education, according to the view adopted in the United States, *is not fulfilled*, in relation to a considerable proportion of the children at their schools."[2] Distinguished Americans, he relates, spoke to him in various parts of the country "in the most distinct and emphatic manner of the visible effect which, in their opinion, the small amount of instruction in the distinctive doctrines of Christianity, and the lax mode of teaching them in the Sunday-schools, were producing on the religious convictions and moral practice of the mass of the people."[3]

---

[1] New York Catholic World, January, 1876, p. 477.

[2] Public Education in the United States, etc., pp. 8, 26.

[3] Id. p. 48.

The Rev. Dr. Edson, Rector of the Protestant Episcopalian Church of St. Anne, Lowell, in the State of Massachusetts, gave him this report, of which the gravity will be equally apparent to observers on both sides of the ocean: "My experience of now nearly thirty years as a pastor has, I am sorry to say, forced upon me the painful conviction that our public school system has undermined already among our population, to a great extent, the doctrines and principles of Christianity." To which some will perhaps reply that it was not intended to do it, and others that they do not care if it does. "I find them generally well grounded in the ordinary elements of what is called common education, and clever and acute as to all worldly matters that concern them, but very lax in their notions of moral obligation and duty, and indisposed to submit to any authority or control whatever, even from a very early age." The Church, it will be admitted, used to form quite other dispositions, and apparently does so still; for whereas Dr. Edson goes on to lament that the Protestant children, as a rule, will not come to the Sunday-school, he admits of the Catholics, with American candor, that "*they* are well looked after by their priests, and I have no doubt that nearly the whole of them attend some Sunday or other catechetical instruction." After describing the general decay of all fixed religious ideas, and the growing contempt for even "parental authority,"—why should they obey the voice of parents, who are taught from the cradle that they may despise that of the Church of God?—he concludes as follows: "I look upon this very prevalent condition of mind with very great apprehension, for all history shows that this is only the first downward step to complete irreligion and infidelity, and thence to a corruption of morals such as was exhibited in the heathen world. I much fear that we are making sure and not very slow strides in that direction; and while I deeply lament it, I am free to confess that I see *no present remedy for it in this country*."[1]

Yet he has himself noticed the contrast, and in his own neighborhood, between the influence of the Catholic Church and the destructive effects of that pagan Secularism which is only one of the poisoned fruits of schism, and a part of that *damnosa hæreditas* of which the Protestant world is the opulent legatee. There *is*, then, a remedy, if people would use it. There are Protestants in America who are wise enough to do so. We should like to know how this candid observer would have accounted for the fact, sufficiently notorious in the United States, that so large a proportion of the youth of both sexes, belonging to the more refined classes, are educated in Catholic schools? The present writer has visited

[1] Tremenheere, pp. 51-53.

many an American convent, in which one-third, and in some cases one-half, of the pupils were Protestant young ladies. The explanation of this fact is furnished by a Protestant witness. Parents who have a care for the purity and dignity of their daughters know that they are safe with the spouses of Christ. "Many well-judging persons, of different religious persuasions, have assured me that the only *really useful and corrective* education is that of the Catholic schools and colleges. So far as I have known, these seminaries are crowded, not only with pupils of their own creed, but with those of other sects. And I have high official authority for saying that the ministers and missionaries of the Roman Catholic Church are at this moment doing more good for the cause of virtue and morality throughout the whole continent of America, than those of any other religious denomination whatever."[1]

If some refuse to appropriate blessings which are within their reach, it is probably because they do not value them. When Moses struck the rock in Horeb, the faint and thirsty wanderers in the desert were not so senseless as to refuse to drink because the miraculous fount of water was a gift from God by his prophet; yet there are millions in our day, who have not yet come out of Egypt, who die of thirst, or vainly seek to assuage it at every foul and noxious pool, rather than accept the water of salvation from his Church. Many of them, at least in America, seem to suspect that they have made an evil choice, and often put down the unfinished cup of death to whisper to one another that it tastes of poison. They shudder at the draught, but the next moment put their lips to it again. In clinging to the system of secular education, with a full apprehension of its deadly fruits, men seem to surpass the common measure of human infatuation. "In a considerable number of the many public schools I have visited," says M. Tremenheere, "in different parts of the United States, I have been struck with the entire absence of good manners on the part of the children. . . . . There was a marked want of any outward demeanor of deference and respect, and, on the part of the teacher, what appeared to me a most singular submission of himself to the children. Nothing was put to them as from authority, but the most trifling command was conveyed in a tone and in language implying that it was for them to judge whether they would obey it or not."[2] How different is the character formed by the spirit of faith and the teaching of the Church, is evident from his own generous confession: "The civilization of the New World," he says, "owes something, I think, to the French Canadians, for keeping alive a reflection of '*the best manners of the old.*'"[3]

[1] The Statesmen of America in 1846, p. 491. [2] Ib., p. 148.
[3] Reply to the Remarks of Thirty-one Boston Schoolmasters, p. 28.

The language of American writers is still more emphatic. Mr. Horace Mann was Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education. He tells us what it proposed to do, and what it actually did. The poles may be said to be in immediate contact compared with the huge interval between the design and its execution. "The *object*," he says, "of the common school of Massachusetts was to give every child in the commonwealth a free, straight, solid pathway by which he could walk directly up from the ignorance of an infant to a knowledge of the primary duties of man, and could acquire *a power and an invincible will to discharge them.*"[1] We should have thought our American friends were more practical engineers than to propose to build a bridge, without any materials and without any supports, of which the heart of an infant should be the buttress at one end, and an "invincible" phantom at the other. They would never span their own broad rivers with fairy structures of that kind. We are not surprised, therefore, to hear that the Massachusetts bridge over the infinite is still *à l'état de projet.* Owing to tumultuous discussions among the engineers, destructive of unity of purpose, "good and pious men wait until delusions more insane than Millerism, and more fanatical and licentious than Mormonism, shall have overspread the land, and generated their broods of scoffers and atheists," having an "invincible will" *not* to discharge their duties. "The influential, the wealthy, the learned, the pious are waiting until the combustible and explosive materials of prejudice and ignorance and sensuality shall have been scattered more profusely through our country, and heaped together in greater masses in our cities, to be kindled by the torch of some political or fanatical Cataline. God grant that when the leading men in our community awaken to a sense of their danger it may not be too late to avert it."[2] The prospect is evidently not cheerful. "I do not hesitate to affirm," he says elsewhere, "that our republican edifice at this time, in present fact and truth, is not sustained by those columns of solid and ever-enduring adamant, intelligence and virtue;" and then, describing "the rotten materials of the edifice," he adds, "unless, therefore, a new substructure can be placed beneath every buttress and angle of this boasted temple of liberty, it will soon totter and fall, and bury all in-dwellers in its ruins."[3] In other words, he thinks of American society in particular what Mr. Carlyle thinks of all Protestantized society in general, that it is "fast wheezing itself to death" in the fetid miasma of *naturalism*, "and deserves to die."

Perhaps any further evidence is superfluous; but as we are be-

[1] Reply to the Remarks of Thirty-one Boston Schoolmasters, p. 28.

[2] Ib., p. 173.

[3] Thoughts selected from the writings of Horace Mann, p. 180.

ginning to adopt in England, owing to inveterate religious conflicts, the secularism in education which has brought America to such a pass, we need not fear to err on the side of excess. On the ninth of last December, the New York *Journal of Commerce*, deserting fiscal for ethical meditations, and referring to President Grant's too famous speech at Des Moines, made this reflection: "So far from prohibiting the teaching of religious tenets in the popular education, we would encourage by every possible argument a more general attention to religious culture wherever children can be brought under such wholesome influence. If we go much further in the direction whither the schools have been drifting, it will soon need something more than an article in the Constitution to keep the whole nation from becoming atheistic or pagan." That this is the logical result of Secularism nobody seems to doubt, and many do not seem to care. "We have been lately told by the public journals that the researches of Professor Agassiz into the growth of the 'social evil' have 'almost destroyed his faith in the boasted civilization of the nineteenth century;' and that 'a large number of the unfortunate women and girls traced their fate to influences which surrounded them *in the public schools.*'"[1] Nor have they even the poor consolation of being able to attribute to the debasing Secularism which kills religion and virtue any compensating influence in promoting mental activity, except in the lowest spheres of thought or human learning and knowledge. "We are behind most nations," says the venerable Dr. Brownson, who knows his country so well, "in *intellectual* and moral culture."[2] It is not strangers, who might be suspected of imperfect sympathy with the country which they describe, who say these things, but honorable Americans, able to estimate religious and social problems, and who look each other in the face without fearing to provoke resentment or contradiction. A New England physician, who shall be our last witness, and whose painful work, dedicated to "the Hon. William Sprague, ex-Governor of and United States Senator from Rhode Island," cannot be read without horror, thus describes in 1871, from a professional point of view, the desolating results of the common school system: "Irreligion and infidelity are progressing *pari passu* with the advanced guards of immorality and crime, and all are fostered, if not engendered, by the materialistic system of school instruction. The entire absence of all religious instruction from the schoolroom, *which has resulted from the utter impossibility of harmonizing the conflicting creeds*, ... is fast bearing fruit in a generation of infidels, and we are becoming worse than even the

[1] New York Catholic World, Jan. 1872, p. 442.
[2] Brownson's Quarterly Review, Oct. 1873, p. 509.

pagans of old, who had at least their positive sciences of philosophy and their religion, such as it was, to oppose which was a criminal offence."[1]

We have now a basis sufficiently solid to support certain practical conclusions which demand the instant attention of all thinking men on both sides of the Atlantic. That Secularism, with its long train of ghastly attendant spectres,—*diræ facies, inimicaque numina*,—the destruction of reverence, obedience, parental authority, faith, virtue, of all, in a word, which constitutes the strength of nations, derives its fatal power from "the utter impossibility of harmonizing" a hundred rival creeds, is admitted both by those who advocate and by those who deplore the exclusion of religion from the common schools. The first contend that religious dissensions have made any other system "impossible;" the second, that, horrible as are its admitted results, there "is no present remedy for it." The evil is breaking up the foundations of society, but it must run its course. All who dread what is coming "are waiting," as Mr. Horace Mann says, till it comes! Yet it is certain that for calamities of a lower order the energetic American nation would soon find a remedy. What is this unmanly despair, this prostrate and impotent acquiescence in intolerable evils, but the evidence of a terrible judgment on the one hand, and on the other, an unconscious confession that Protestantism, by its destruction of all first principles, disintegration of faith and unity, suppression of authority, and ceaseless multiplication of rival sects, is ruining the life of nations, and preparing the way for Antichrist? What we see around us is but the fulfilment of an Apostolic prediction. Both St. Peter and St. Paul speak of "sects," which they call "works of the flesh," and of "self-willed teachers," as the special note and evil distinction of "*the last times*." They have come, as they foretold; and instead of inspiring fear, disgust, and condemnation, the very types in which their prophetic eye discerned the heralds and forerunners of Antichrist,—the men who "despise government," defame the Church, and "fear not to bring in sects,"[2]—are the popular dispensers of such shreds of religion as their contemporaries choose to accept, the echoes of all the antagonistic voices and humors of this lower world, and the boast of "modern civilization!" The unpardonable *crimes* of the apostolic age have become the characteristic *virtues* of ours! And the intelligent world, "plausibly amused," smiles at its own improvement. As each prophetic "seal" is opened, and the last tragic scene of the human drama approaches, it sees, not the signs of impending ruin, but of salutary progress. Nobody doubts that in the judgment of the Apostles, Secularism

[1] Satan in Society, p. 51.

[2] 2 Pet. ii: 10.

would have been regarded as a compact, conscious or otherwise, between those two familiar allies, Satan and the world, for the destruction of the Christian faith and of human society. Nobody denies that, whether its advocates intend it or not, that result is being everywhere promoted "by sure and not slow strides." We are entitled, therefore, to ask—at least of all who still admit that union with God is advantageous to man, and that the tried instrument which alone during so many ages cemented that union is of simply incalculable value—what has the world gained, either intellectually or spiritually, either for time or eternity, by suppressing the Church which was the invincible guardian both of piety and learning, in order to substitute a new agency, which only destroys the one without adding anything to the other?

For even the admirers of Secularism perceive, and often proclaim, that the Church is doing the same work at this hour in the whole earth, forming the same characters and developing the same supernatural virtues, as in all the ages of the past. In the New World as in the old, she is training in the same hour dear children of God and loyal citizens of the State, and is the only efficient champion, as a Protestant writer has told us, "of the cause of virtue and morality throughout the whole continent of America." Is the world so obstinately bent on self-destruction, as to refuse the benefits of which she is the sole and inexhaustible source? If she gave it in the past all the truth, liberty, civilization, and refinement it ever possessed, is there any sign that she has lost the power to confer the same gifts in the present? The mould is not broken in which the pure gold with which she works takes its form. Look, says the Bishop of Orleans, contrasting her daughters with the unsexed types around them, at the army of consecrated virgins who go forth in her name and with her blessing to the ends of the earth, in quest of every want which can be relieved and every sorrow which can be consoled; and since you profess so much admiration for cultivation of mind, consider that "the three books which have perhaps been most widely read in our time are the works of Catholic ladies, the *Récit d'une Sœur*, the *Mémoires d'Eugénie de Guérin*, and the *Lettres de Madame Swetchine*."[1] But the same Church which in every age has offered to the love of God and the veneration of man, women like St. Agnes, St. Catharine, and St. Teresa, has not lost the art of creating men like St. Benedict, St. Francis, and the Curé d'Ars. And even her less worthy sons, who do not attain to *their* level—the thousands who, in a lower spiritual sphere, live in her light and act by her maxims—are, in America as in Europe,

[1] La Femme Studieuse, ch. x, p. 265.

models of civic as well as of religious fidelity, true patriots and loyal citizens, lovers of their country as well as of their God, submissive to human while subject to divine law, and the very pith and marrow of earthly States, of which they never disturb the harmony by the selfishness of private aims, nor menace the existence by factious sedition, or the more fatal conspiracies of religious license. It is not they who disturb the repose of statesmen, or alarm the solicitude of magistrates; for their only weapon against the unjust is prayer, their only answer to the persecutor, resignation. And even when oppression becomes intolerable, when triumphant iniquity marks them as victims, and the knife of the secret assassin, or the axe of the public executioner falls upon them, they utter no imprecation, wisely content to bless the hand which gives them an earlier deliverance from a world which is not worthy of them. How easy would it be to govern that foolish world, and how tranquil would be the life of kings and peoples, of cabinets and legislatures, if they had only to fear the rebellion of those who never revolt, and the machinations of those who never conspire! Yet the imprudent rulers of that delirious world not only refuse alliance with the only power which can give them assured peace, the only force from which they have nothing to fear, but affect to regard this friend and guide of every soul of man as the special enemy against whom they must keep vigilant watch, lest it should artfully undermine the *authority* of which God has made it the supreme expression and unfailing support, or compromise the *liberty* which it prizes more than any human good, because it is the fruit and evidence of that diviner gift of which God has said, "the *truth* shall make you *free*."

It would seem that human folly could go no further. Yet it seeks still lower depths. There are even cases in which the perverse imbecility of earthly rulers, complicated by sordid political motives, seems to transcend the limits of the possible, and pass into the fantastic region of the formless and intangible. It is a bitter reflection that the government of the great and generous people of the United States should furnish the most discreditable example. We need not fear to misinterpret the incendiary speech of President Grant, at Des Moines, because all its critics, English and American, understand it in the same way. The former, in spite of their devotion to Protestantism, are unanimous in condemning it. Even the *Saturday Review* calls it contemptuously "a bid for Protestant votes;" while the *Pall Mall Gazette* sees in this reckless and criminal disturbance of public order a proof that "patriotism" is not General Grant's distinguishing virtue. Mr. Carl Schurz, a prominent orator of the Republican party, is reported to have said that its incitement to religious fanaticism, "serves better as a cloak for

public rogues than as an instrument for national purification."[1] The *Review*, from which we borrow this observation, considers the speech an indication that "an unscrupulous political organization will create a third factor in our national elections," and that this wanton crusade against "so conservative, so law-abiding, and so useful a body as the Catholics of the United States," is mainly an artifice to divert public attention from ignoble frauds in which official persons are commonly believed to be involved. The New York *Catholic World*, to which we looked with interest for a reliable estimate of the President's electioneering rhetoric, discusses his speech in an acute and ingenious article, which will probably afford no little amusement to our brethren of the United States. Affecting, with a finesse which will not deceive their penetration, but which was perfectly legitimate on such an occasion, to accept General Grant's words in their literal meaning, our excellent contemporary thanks him, with diverting gravity, for uttering sentiments which are so entirely its own. "For we find nothing in the oration with which we are in the least disposed to take issue."[2] We also, the *World* adds, referring to the President's injunction to "*encourage free schools*," have always contended for the same boon. "Do we hear aright? Does the President of the United States maintain the proposition which has brought us so much contempt and derision? *What is a free school?* A free school is one in which every scholar can obtain an education without violating the honest convictions of conscience;" whereas, the pretended free schools of America are conducted on a principle which excludes a large section of the population from entering them. "To my certain knowledge," says a writer in the *Catholic Review*,[3] "there is in the whole United States not one single German Catholic congregation, having as many as seventy-five children, which is without a school of their own;" and the same thing is true, in various proportions, and according to the means at their disposal, of the Catholics of other nationalities. On a much smaller scale it is even true, we believe, of certain Protestant congregations. In all such cases, affecting probably at least one-fourth of the entire population, American citizens are compelled by a cruel and oppressive law to support schools which, as Dr. Edson told Mr. Tremenheere, "have undermined already, to a great extent, the doctrines and principles of Christianity;" and at the same time to accept the heavy burden of building and maintaining *other* schools, in which no such deadly results are to be feared. By all means, then, says the *Catholic World*, let us have the "free schools" which the President so warmly recom-

[1] Quoted in the Catholic Review, December 21st, 1875.
[2] Catholic World, January, 1876, p. 435.
[3] January 8th, 1876.

mends. We have not got them yet, but if he can help us to obtain what we have so long coveted, why should we refuse to co-operate with so powerful an ally? As an argumentative retort nothing can be more effective, and the irony is maintained with equal power and adroitness in relation to all the other clauses of President Grant's deplorable speech. But, while we applaud the prudent artifice of our American contemporary, who has contrived, in deference to a misguided public opinion, to expose injustice and rebuke insincerity in terms so inoffensive, the fact remains in all its shameful enormity, that the Chief Magistrate of a great nation, which by its Constitution is neither Catholic nor Protestant, has stooped to identify his private and personal interests with a scheme of public education which is creating, in the words of Mr. Horace Mann, "a generation of infidels, worse even than the pagans of old;" and that he inflicts this wrong on his country from no purer motive than the desire to vivify and reorganize his own political faction, utterly indifferent that its triumph should be purchased by the suppression of Christian liberty and the dissolution of public order, and by letting loose against the most religious and law-abiding section of the American community the worst passions of all for whom religion is only a name, and law only an instrument of oppression.

Only this incident was wanting to complete our estimate of Secularism, the agents by whom it is promoted, the motives on which they act, and the ruinous results to which their selfish and evil policy tends. Yet Secularism, as all classes concur in stating, is nothing but a product of "the utter impossibility of harmonizing multiform creeds." In other words, it is a product of the so-called Reformation, and, we suppose, one of its peculiar titles to the admiration of the human race. Like many other results of that anarchic movement, of which we perceive more clearly every year the fatal action upon modern society, it perplexes statesmen, puzzles preachers, and suggests to both that as religion is a factor of human life so unpliant and intractable, the only remedy is to get rid of it altogether. And they get rid of it accordingly. If after being expelled from the school it can contrive to maintain a precarious existence in the family, there is at present no law, even in Prussia, prohibiting that expiring effort. Modern legislation is yet content, with benevolent forbearance, to refuse it all public recognition, and, in once Catholic England, to sweep the children of God into the schools of Satan, with a coercive discipline of fines and imprisonment for all who refuse to come, or tarry on the way. The devout pupils of our Board schools, or at least a good many of them, may be safely trusted to pursue the system to its logical term, when they assume in their turn the civic toga, and to hunt religion out of the family, as their

teachers have hunted it out of the school. And then people will be able to say of England, as Dr. Edson says of America, that secular education has proved to be "only the first downward step to complete irreligion and infidelity, and thence to a corruption of morals such as was exhibited in the heathen world." Perhaps when that auspicious era arrives, some Englishmen will still be found to say with Lord Bacon, only using the past instead of the future tense: "The misery is that the most effectual means *have been* applied to the ends least to be desired."

We may now be permitted to ask once more, in conclusion, without excessive or indiscreet curiosity, what the world conceives itself to have gained thus far, and what it hopes to gain in the future, by usurping the teaching office of the Church, and forbidding her any share in public education? We are quite willing to take its own account of the matter. If it can point to *any* definite and realized gains—moral, intellectual, or social—let it tell us what they are. Is this too much to ask? It may choose any region of the earth where Secularism is throned for the field of comparison. Shall it be Germany, England, or the United States? It may compare its own *best* pupils with the peasants of Ireland, Spain, or Italy, or even those of Chili and Peru, who know nothing but their catechism, from which they have learned both dignity of life and true philosophy. There is a good deal of Secularism in China, India, and Central Africa, with the usual cheerful results; but perhaps the world would prefer to apply the test nearer home. If it will only apply it *somewhere*, we shall be quite content. But we venture to stipulate that it shall be applied fairly and honestly. Now all possible or imaginable advantages which can accrue to man may be classed under two heads: those which affect him in his relations to God, and those which concern his position in relation to society. We assume that even the world will hardly pretend that Secularism has done much for him as respects the first. It does not profess to have brought him into more intimate communion with God. To do that, even if it had the power, is no part of its programme. But perhaps if Secularism affords him no help as a Christian, it consoles and elevates him as a citizen. To this proposition we take a preliminary objection. There is no example in the history of our race, at any time or in any country, and least of all in the highly cultivated societies of pagan antiquity, of either an individual or a community tending to higher social perfection, while constantly descending in the scale of moral and religious worth. That is the candid testimony of all the sages of Egypt, Greece, and Rome. The burden of life was so intolerable to *them*, under conditions which modern society is striving to reproduce, that while they vainly invoked a Deliverer, the sum

of all their thoughts was expressed, in every dialect which they spoke, in that "wild word" *despair*. They had matchless poets and artists, temples of surpassing beauty, public highways with which we have nothing to compare; yet morally they were dogs, and they knew it. The whole world of that epoch, it has been forcibly said, was divided into "beasts of burden and beasts of prey." The great law of nature was almost abolished, and instead of desiring to prolong life, the chief aspiration of many, including the most cultivated, was to have done with it. There was nothing to live for! And then, in this crisis of its unutterable distress, our compassionate God had pity on that perishing world, and there arose, in sight of heaven and earth, a Vision of unimagined beauty —"coming forth as the morning rising, fair as the moon, bright as the sun, terrible as an army set in array"[1]—to which He, at whose word it sprang into life, gave this triumphal name, "THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD." Man wanted a teacher, and at last he found one. The reign of darkness was over. From that hour no soul of man was doomed to perish for lack of a guide. All that omnipotent love can do for the children of men shall be done, henceforth and to the end of time, by and through this Holy Church. In unity and authority it shall be second only to God. "The glory of Libanus is given to it, the beauty of Carmel and Saron; they shall see the glory of the Lord, and the beauty of our God."[2] We have seen it, and see it now, in the darkest night as in the brightest day, reflected in the burnished mirror of that unfailing Church. Like her Divine Founder she may say to the world, as she points to all the enduring monuments of her long and beneficent reign,—the countless saints whom she has formed for heaven, the unnumbered boons which she has imparted to earth,—"What more could I have done for thee, and have not done it?" Whatever there is on earth at this hour of truth, peace, and hope; whatever it still retains of concord, civilization, and pure refinement, comes from her. If the wrath of the Avenger is turned aside, and the bolt which was about to fall arrested; if the loving patience of God still waits for the return of the penitent; if evil does not wholly triumph over good, nor the children of light lose heart in their combat with the prince of this world; it is the Church, the *unchanged* and *unreformed* Church,—the Church, that is, *as God made her*, before impious imbecility pretended to improve his imperfect work,—which stays judgment, redresses wrong, makes justice triumph, and conquers the gates of hell. All the true joys we taste in this world, and all the rational hopes we form for the next; all the benedictions which God can give or man receive,—the light

[1] Cantic. vi : 9.

[2] Isaias xxxv : 2.

of faith, the fire of charity, the virtue of the sacraments, and the strong protection of the Saints and of their glorious Queen,—are ours only because we are hers. Even the senseless world enjoys a respite from its inevitable doom, and is less vile than it would be, because she offers every day on her thousand altars the tremendous Sacrifice of reparation. As He listens to her voice, God forgets to punish, and the guilty escape, at least for a time, because the innocent hide them from the Judge.

Yet the thankless world, at the bidding of the cruel chief who rules not to save but to destroy it, greets her only with a frown of defiance, and finds nothing wiser to say to this Messenger of God and Teacher of the Nations than such words as these: "Depart from me, and leave me to myself. The benefits which you offer have no attractions for me. Your counsels weary and your reproofs affront me. I loathe the unity which has its source in authority, and the order which can only be maintained by submission. Chaos and anarchy have no terrors for me. They are the element in which I live. I have not, as you seem to imagine, any need of you. I can teach myself, or remain untaught. I am my own law-giver, prophet, priest, and king. When I am tired of one code of laws, I make another. If you provoke me, I can make laws for you as well as for myself. I have done so before now. Your impotent sentence, by your own admission, only takes effect in the next world; mine enforces its penalties in this. You and yours have had some taste of them already. There is war between us, not peace, and we serve not the same master. If I cannot have order except in alliance with you, I dispense with it; and if I must perish, as you tell me, I would rather perish without your help than be saved by it."

We seem to understand now why even He who came to seek that which was lost said: "*I pray not for the world.*"[1] Must we, then, conclude that its case is hopeless? Not quite. The Church will plead for it to the last with her mighty intercession. She is able to save not only her own, but many who as yet know her not. She will save by *teaching* them. The world may stop its ears, but the great Mother of all elect souls will not cease to speak. The Spirit of God is upon her, and speak she must. Even in this age of pagan Secularism she will continue to teach; and there is joy in the thought that many a poor captive of the world and the sects will listen in spite of himself, and, while she perseveres in teaching, will consent at last to be taught.

---

[1] John xvii: 9.

RAMBLES IN THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS.

NEARLY three-quarters of a century ago Captains Lewis and Clarke of the United States army made their remarkable explorations through the Rocky Mountains, and published an account which, to schoolboys of their day, vied in interest with Robinson Crusoe, at the same time that it possessed the charm of being fact instead of fiction.

These bold explorers, passing through an immense tract of country where no white man had ever been before, encountered, on their way up the Missouri River, the Great Falls. Making a portage around these of about twenty miles, they continued their way up the main stream in a southerly direction for over a hundred miles, when they came to what is still called "The Three Forks."

The branch coming from the west was named the *Jefferson*. It being a little the largest of the three, and bearing more nearly in the direction the explorers desired to travel in order to cross the main divide of the Continent, they followed it to near its source in the main range of the Rocky Mountains, where the stream was so small that one of the party placed himself with a foot on each side, and "thanked God he had lived to see the day when he could bestride the great Missouri."

The middle fork was named the *Madison*, and flows directly north from its source away off in the snowy range to the south. The original explorers little dreamed of the wonders to be found around its head-waters, where is situated the Great Geyser basin of the West. Had any rumors of the magnificent spouting geysers to be seen there reached them, Captain Clarke on his return trip would probably have proceeded up the Madison instead of choosing the third of the three forks for his explorations.

The third or eastern fork was called the *Gallatin*, and takes its rise to the south and east in ranges of high mountains not forming a part of the continental divide. Up this fork Captain Clarke, in the summer of 1804, when returning from the mouth of the Columbia, took his way, and, after passing through one of the most magnificent valleys of the whole West, reached its head near the present site of the military post of Fort Ellis. This post guards several passes leading to the eastward through the range of mountains which separates the waters of the Gallatin from those of the Yellowstone. Through one of these passes, under the guidance of a friendly Indian squaw, Captain Clarke reached the Yellowstone; and constructing boats from the timber on its banks, he proceeded down the river to its mouth, unwittingly turning his back upon the

great wonders of the Yellowstone, some account of which I purpose to give.

On a warm pleasant morning in July, 1872, a party of nine persons on horseback wound its way out of Fort Ellis and over the rolling hills behind towards a deep cañon, through which dashes one of the bright forks of the East Gallatin. Preceding the party were three or four pack-mules loaded down with bedding and buffalo robes, hard tack and bacon, pots, kettles, and pans for the trip. One of these mules was strongly suspected of having served for a long time in the army, for he had not gone far from the post before he began to play "old soldier," and very quietly laid down in the road, refusing to rise until a part of his load was removed and placed upon the back of one of his stronger or more willing companions, furnishing thus another evidence of the truth of the Darwinian theory that the lower animals are governed by the same feelings and principles as the more recent and, in some cases, the nobler development.

Through a wild deep gorge up into the rolling hills beyond, the party pursues its way, stopping now and then to adjust a pack, to allow the animals to nibble the fresh green grass which lines the road, or to drink from the clear ice-cold streams through which the wily trout is seen to dart at every step.

Bright green slopes dotted with flowers rise in succession before us. At length we reach the last one; the waters run the other way, and before us lies the broad beautiful valley of the Yellowstone, partially hidden by intervening hills, and bounded on the east by mountain peaks towering to the skies, floating clouds about their tops, and great snow-drifts extending far down the gorges in their sides.

We follow down a beautiful little valley, leave it where it turns towards the Yellowstone, and, rising a gentle slope to our right, reach the top of a commanding ridge, from which we have an unobstructed view of the Yellowstone River and its valley. It stretches far up to the mountains on our right, and away off to our left enters the gorge of what is called the first or lower cañon. Opposite to us the land rises in successive terraces or "benches," showing where, in long ages past, existed the shores of a great inland lake, which, fed by the streams above, remained at the level of these "benches," until the river, thundering through the gorge below, wore for itself a lower passage-way. Then the waters, draining out, lowered the level of the lake, which there remained until another break in the cañon below took place; the rains and snows of season after season in the meantime bringing down from the mountains around the disintegrated rock and vegetable matter to form in the edges of the lake these level benches; and so on until the

cañon was worn down to the bottom of the lake, when the river cut out a channel for itself at the lowest level, and left these benches to tell us how they were formed.

On these level benches great herds of cattle are feeding on the luxurious "bunch" grass which covers them. Here they can live and fatten all the year round, save only in those exceptional winters when snow falls to a great depth and lies for a long time on the ground. The sight of these cattle reminds us of civilization; we take a good look at them; for it is about the last of such signs we shall see for some time to come.

We reach the bank of the Yellowstone just as the sun is sinking behind the high mountain peaks in our rear, forming long bands of bright sunlight and dark shadows across the valley. Our bivouac is formed beneath a wide-spreading cottonwood, and whilst the mules are being unpacked our rods are brought out, and, before the cook is ready for them, we have wriggling upon the grass around our camp-fire, enough fine brook trout to supply the whole party with a hearty supper.

No one but a man who has ridden for twenty-five or thirty miles through a new and interesting country, can appreciate the appetites with which those trout, fresh from the cold waters of the Yellowstone, were enjoyed, nor the sound sleep which followed our feast.

We slept as tops are proverbially said to sleep, breathing the pure air of heaven, with no canopy but the star-bedecked sky; and opened our eyes to greet the smiling sun as he came up over the tops of the mountains the next morning. Remember this was the last day of July, we were in sight of perpetual snow, the night was cool, we were covered with blankets and buffalo robes, and you who were sweltering in the heat of the East, may be able to fancy how we did sleep.

Our route the next day led us directly up the valley of the Yellowstone, growing narrower and more narrow as we approached the place where the river leaves the mountains. At times the trail, a well-marked wagon-road, led directly along the bank of the river, still unusually high for this season of the year; its peculiar light-green waters being tinged with mud. Now and then the stream was divided by wooded islands; and in places where from the formation of eddies the water had a chance to settle and become comparatively clear, great trout could be seen lying lazily in the water with heads up stream, or dashing suddenly to the surface to capture some imprudent fly, which, unmindful of the many sharp eyes on the watch for him, would venture too near the surface. In other places our route would lead us across the flat prairie bottom far back from the river-bank, where occasionally would lie a great tree-trunk, devoid of limbs and rubbed smooth, showing how at times

during the spring freshets, the water extended back so as to cover all but the highest points.

We passed several ranches with little patches of cultivated gardens flourishing with potatoes, onions, tomatoes, and other vegetables, and at one of them two or three little tow-headed children appeared on the door-step, to look with open-eyed wonder at the unusual sight of a party of white men.

Suddenly a fence appears, and inclosed by it a wide field of luxuriant grain. We cross the irrigating ditches leading from the hills, and from which this field obtains its moisture, and approach a house nestling in a beautiful little nook in the hills, surrounded by a grove of trees, and with a clear stream alongside. This is Boettler's ranche, with one exception the most advanced of the settlements in the valley. Here is kept a post-office; and letters and papers are mixed up with milk pans, cups, and butter dishes. For Boettler's is a dairy ranche, and one portion of it is literally filled with pans full of rich cream-covered milk, from which we are invited to drink with true Western hospitality. The noisy brook as it tumbles down from the hills has been led into a trough, and rendered still more noisy by being made to turn a wheel attached, with Yankee ingenuity, to a churn, where butter for the Bogeman market, some forty miles away, is made. It costs nothing to keep the cows, which roam at will over the broad rich bottom land or crop the sweet bunch grass on the foot-hills.

We turned our backs upon Boettler's thrifty homelike ranche, and continued up the river towards the second cañon. South of us on the other side of the river "Emigrant Peak" rears its top amidst the clouds, and in a deep gorge at its foot in "Emigrant Gulch," men are delving for gold. The mountains now come down close to the river-bank, and in one place we have to cross a steep spur along which the trail, still a wagon-road, runs, with the great river roaring as it rushes along, far below and almost under our feet.

We are now approaching the second cañon of the Yellowstone, and after crossing two deep rapid mountain torrents, turn to the left, and, leaving the wagon-tracks, which terminate here, follow a narrow trail into the mountains. At the very mouth of the gorge stands a great rock, a hundred feet high or more, and as we pass along at its foot, its face towards the cañon is seen to be worn as smooth almost as glass, with here and there deep furrows. This is a relic of the far-distant past, standing here like some old sentinel of the guards, to speak with his seams and scars of the battles he has passed through. As it cannot, like the old soldier, shoulder a crutch and tell how fields were won, we shall have to do it instead, and fancy the time when this immense gorge in front of us

was filled to the top perhaps with a mass of ice, rock, sand, and rubbish slowly pushing its way down to the sea. This great glacier encounters here in its path the solid obstacle. Against it the mass crushes and grinds; other masses come behind, driving the forward portions ahead, and trying to open a way to the sea. Bravely the old sentinel stands his ground, whilst high up upon his front the rocky, icy mass is piled, and goes grinding, crushing across his face towards the narrow gorge at his side, down which it finally makes its way, flanking the obstacle, but leaving upon its face ample records of the struggle to tell to future ages the battles of the past.

Passing the "old sentinel" our way becomes more and more contracted; shut in by high hills on the right, by immense mountain peaks on the left, with the river dashing along at their feet. Right before us rises a steep wall of rock, seemingly barring out further progress; but wild animals have been here before us, and tame ones too; for far up along the steep hill somebody has evidently been trying to cut a road. We pick our way carefully among the rocks and along the narrow path, dismounting here and there where the route is steeper or more difficult than usual.

At length we reach the top, and gaze with silent wonder at the grand view before us. Still towering above our heads the hills on our right are covered with timber, whilst on the left the far higher, rugged, rocky peaks are devoid of all foliage except a few scraggly pines, and the long smooth slopes of their disintegrating sides in places extend from near the top down hundreds of feet to the very edge of the river, into which fragments of rock are continually falling. Directly before us lies a peaceful little green valley crossed by sparkling streams, beyond which rises another wall of rocks, narrowing the valley until there is just room enough left for the river to make its way. On the left, and almost beneath our feet, rushes the river, here of a bright sea-green color, there churned into a milk-white foam, where the channel is still further contracted by great masses of rock which have toppled from the crags above.

Beyond, far up through the gorge, the country widens out into a green valley covered with trees, through which the Yellowstone is quietly flowing preparatory to its mad rush through the gorge below, whilst still further beyond, as far as the eye can reach, mountains rise above mountains to the skies.

We take a long look at the wild but beautiful scenery, and then lead our horses down a steep slope to the valley below. Crossing this, we enter the narrowest part of the gorge, picking our way along the narrow path, between overhanging masses of rocks, sometimes crowded so close together as barely to allow room for the passage of a horse, much less a horseman. Many an exclamation of pain

is uttered as shins come in contact with the sharp rocks, and one is tempted to echo the wish of the discontented individual who made the remark, that if *he* had had originally the making of man, he should have put the calf of the leg in front, where it would at least have been of some use. Here the slightest misstep would send one hurling into the raging caldron below.

After making the passage in safety, we halt to wait for the packs, eat a lunch, fish, and shoot young grouse, which are just now reaching a proper size. The packs get through for a wonder without being rubbed off more than once, and we push ahead again over dry arid hills to our camp by the side of a mountain torrent, by whose music we are lulled to sleep after a hearty supper on immense trout caught in the deep quiet pools.

The country is now becoming more broken and rougher than before. Dark, black, volcanic hills rise up in all directions around us, throwing up here and there a peak higher than the rest, in the gorges near the tops of which banks of snow appear, and from these come the ice-cold streams which cross our path at intervals. The disintegrating sides of some of these hills present a curious appearance, looking for all the world as if some great factory had been for ages dumping down on the slopes all their refuse coal and scoria. Some of the hills again present in places bright-red streaks suggestive of iron or cinnabar, and one of these is so strongly marked that it has been named "The Cinnabar Mountain." If it deserved its name it would prove a mine of wealth, and would ere this have been covered with "claims;" but no valuable metal, I believe, has up to this time been discovered in the vicinity.

Our route to-day leads us along the foot of "Cinnabar Mountain;" when we reach its southern face the formation of the mountain is seen, and in one place presents a curious spectacle. Volcanic action has thrown up the layers of rocks until the strata stand almost vertical, outcropping towards the sky. In some places the outcropped edges have become disintegrated, and form slopes extending from the top of the mountain in curves to the bottom. This is especially marked in one place, where the disintegrated material of a deep-red color sweeps in a graceful curve for hundreds of feet down the side of the mountain. Of course, the softest material is disintegrated first and fastest. Where the rock is very hard the weather seems to have but little effect upon it. Hence results a remarkable formation, to which the name of "The Devil's Slide" has been given. Two great ledges of hard rock have been thrown up until they stand vertically across the length of the mountain. These ledges, some six or eight feet across, are distant from each other some three or four hundred feet. Between the two the softer material has been entirely washed out to a depth, in places, of some

hundred feet, leaving these great bare walls standing like the ways of some immense shipyard. The immensity of the work done impresses one with the magnitude of the watery power which performed it, and the long period which must have elapsed since the forces ceased to act, is shown by the great trees now growing in the amphitheatre between the walls, and the still larger ones which lie decaying on the ground.

We turned our backs upon "The Devil's Slide," casting many a glance behind, supposing we were taking a last look, and little thinking that in a day or two some of us should see it again.

Our route now leads us over ranges of desolate barren hills till we strike the valley of Gardner's River, up which we turn to the right, following a plainly marked trail along its bank. After travelling some five or six miles the trail grows suddenly fainter, and soon disappears entirely in the grass. The appearance of the country, several streams of warm water, which our horses refuse to drink, and the hollow sound given out by our horses' feet, assure us that the object of our search, the Hot Springs, cannot be far distant. All eyes are turned upon the ground searching for the trail. Some one looks up, and an exclamation of surprise arrests the attention of the whole party. Looking over to our right a great snow-white hill is seen looming up like an immense snowbank, surrounded by timbered mountains. We turn towards it and cross several smoking streams, where the yielding and hollow-sounding rocks under our horses' feet produce the disagreeable impression that it is barely possible we might break through and be swallowed up in some great caldron, or disappear we hardly knew where; but the smoking water suggests that the place might be uncomfortably warm.

As we proceed, however, we gain confidence and finally reach solid ground in a belt of tall timber, through which passes a trail with fresh horse-tracks upon it. This we follow, gradually rising until we reach an open and perfectly level plateau upon which, here and there, a great tree is growing, and bright-colored flowers are occasionally seen. To our left and in front of us high hills, covered with trees and grass, rise up from the plateau.

The dusty trail and some horses in a grove near by assure us we are nearing the end of our day's journey. Turning a point of the hill to our left, a magnificent but novel view bursts upon us. The valley, shut in by high hills, is, where we stand, only about two hundred yards across. It widens out farther up to as much as a mile and a half. As far as we can see, the whole valley above us is filled with a pure white marble-like structure, arranged in terraces, one of which stands some fifty or sixty feet in height, and is the snow-white hill we first noticed.

Directly before us stands a column sixty or seventy feet high, which from its form has been named "The Cap of Liberty." At its foot, and extending some distance beyond, is a structure which looks as if the giants of old had been laying a foundation of the purest white marble for some great edifice. The perfectly horizontal tiers rise one above the other like successive layers of masonry, and at a little distance each successive layer looks as if composed of stone on which the chisel of the sculptor has engraved the most exquisite forms. We stop and look in wonder, dismount, and walk through a substance which reminds one of walking on loose flour. Approaching a place where the substance is a little damp, we take up handfuls of it, and find it just like plaster of Paris, and moulding in the hand like putty.

A closer inspection shows that the horizontal lines, which at a distance resembled layers of masonry, are the rims of basins formed by the deposition of material held in solution by the water. These basins are of all sizes, generally of a semicircular form, and rise to a height determined by the level to which the water rises in each. If, from any cause, more water runs in, the deposition takes place most rapidly on the edge, where the water is stillest, building up the edge and keeping it always just above the surface of the water at all points, and hence always perfectly level. Where the water runs out of this basin another one is formed, and so on indefinitely. Any one can start a new basin to forming by breaking an opening in one of the old ones.

The formation, although solid enough to bear our weight, yields to the foot, and as we move about we destroy thousands of beautiful forms, which probably have been years in forming. At first a feeling of regret is experienced at the idea of such destruction, but this is soon removed by the reflection that thousands of new ones are forming every day, and in every direction, wherever the water runs. These basins rise, step by step, from the general level of the plateau to a height of six or eight feet, where a large oval basin of boiling hot water is found, the source of all the basins below. We are warned by the heated air and seeing the centre of the pool boiling up eighteen or twenty inches high, not to test the heat of the water with an imprudent hand.

But whilst we are waiting, looking at and admiring all these wonders, our poor animals are nearly eaten up by the great buck-flies, which swarm around them like bees. Teeth, tail, and feet are kept constantly at work to beat them off; and now we begin to understand why it is that the drove of horses we have just passed are, on a warm day like this, crowded so closely together, trying each one to get in the centre of the herd, and rubbing against each other to drive away the innumerable pests.

In a pretty little valley close by, thickly shaded with trees, and with a stream of snow-water tumbling down through it, several rude cabins appear. Near these are a number of tents pitched, and farther back shelters of a ruder kind, pieces of canvas stretched over a ridge-pole, with perhaps one end closed by a blanket. These are all for the shelter of the invalids who come out to this modern Saratoga of the wilderness in search of that health which the use of these waters is said in the most marvellous manner to bring.

Men, women, children, and dogs rush out to greet the newcomers; and a shade of disappointment may be seen to pass over the faces of some when all of us leap lightly from our saddles, and none, in the last stages of disease, need to be helped off; so natural is it for "misery to love company."

We locate our bivouac higher up in this pretty little vale; and saddles, bridles, and packs are hastily stripped from our suffering animals, with the hope that by rolling or running they may gain some relief from the swarms of flies. We were soon assured by the oldest inhabitants of the place that there was absolutely no escape for the poor creatures, as they were tormented all day long by a constant succession of flies, and that animals sometimes "*stampeded*" under the infliction, and sought places lower down the river, where the flies were not so bad. To guard against losing our horses, it was proposed to picket them out, but we were assured this was certain death, as no picketed animal could defend himself against the swarms of flies, and we soon, by ocular proof, became satisfied of that fact and let our animals run loose. The poor creatures, maddened by their pests, which would settle like a swarm of bees on their withers as the safest spot, ran off to the hills, and we felt secure in the fact that they were tired by their day's journey, and probably would not go far.

The buck-flies did not trouble us so much as they did the horses; but swarms of mosquitoes, bred probably by the ponds of warm water, surrounded us, and we were glad after a lunch to move about and explore the vicinity of our novel position.

Our first visit was to the neighborhood of the "Cap of Liberty." This singular column we found on inquiry to be hollow. In ages past this open space was filled with the hot water of the springs from above, which, running over at the top, deposited the substance it held in solution, and built up the column now standing. In the course of time the water found an outlet at some lower level, and left the column standing to tell its own story as to how it was formed. The storms and frosts of many a winter have beaten against it, and decreased somewhat its dimensions, without much, if any, lessening its height. Not far off stands another column of

smaller size, and, standing between the two, the rush of subterranean waters could be plainly heard. On the plateau, between the two columns, several bath-houses have been erected, and troughs from the main spring conduct the water into the bathing-tubs. We saw the first primitive bathing-tub which had been used. It consisted simply of a hole dug in the soft yielding material large enough for bathing, and into this the water, hot from the spring, was led by a trough hollowed out of the surface of the ground. Over the hole is pitched a tent, and this constitutes the bathing establishment.

Other more pretentious structures have since been erected, and these are now occupied by wooden bathing-tubs, to which the water is conducted in wooden troughs. Three or four of these bathing-houses are scattered over the plateau, and each one is supposed to possess some special health-giving qualities; this one for rheumatism, that for gout, etc. Not being possessed of any chronic disease, and it being a warm afternoon, I chose for my ablutions the coolest bath to be found. A stream of what was called cool water was turned on, and I prepared for the bath with a feeling of satisfaction at the coming luxury. The feeling was, however, short-lived, and at the first plunge I thought I was so too, and uttered what must have sounded to outsiders like a dying warwhoop, for the water was almost scalding hot, and the sensation experienced somewhat akin to what may be imagined that of a lobster when being prepared for the table. What the *hot* baths would be I did not care to test, but for the benefit of future visitors I would suggest they go prepared with bathing dresses made of asbestos or some other heat-defying material. As I languidly sauntered back to camp I took a better look at the boiling caldron which supplies all this heated water. Thinking over my recent experience I could not help fancying what a splendid institution this would be for one of those hotels where all the provisions, beef, pork, mutton, wild turkey, tame turkey, venison, ducks, and potatoes taste as if boiled together in the same pot. On the edge of the pool, where the water is more shallow and cooler than elsewhere, a thin film of porcelain-like structure forms, looking like a thin layer of ice. As if in keeping with my idea regarding cookery several pots, kettles, pans, and bottles were standing in this shallow part, imbedded through the sheet of ice. Had the water been cold it would naturally be supposed these vessels contained milk and other substances placed there to cool. As it was, we were informed they were filled with the yeast settlings of the visiting housekeepers, put there to rise.

Later in the afternoon, when it became cooler, we all sallied out on an exploring expedition to see wonders which we were informed were awaiting us higher up the valley. Taking a steep, well-worn

path, we mounted to the plateau immediately behind that on which stands the "Cap of Liberty."

This plateau is evidently an old one, for the pure white of recent formation is replaced by a dull-brown, the surface is much disintegrated and worked down into a soil. Here and there large pine trees are growing, and patches of grass and flowers are scattered about. Now and then we pass a vent with hot steam hissing forth, and occasionally a hole is met with from which the gurgling sound of subterranean waters issues.

Right before us is the grandest spectacle of all. On the far side of the plateau rises the wall of the next one. Tiers of beautiful pure white basins rise one above the other to the height of sixty or seventy feet—the basins of all possible shapes and sizes. Most of these are filled with water in all states of temperature except cold. Some are cool enough to bear the insertion of the hand; others are still and covered with the thin ice-like film already referred to; whilst others are in an active state of ebullition, showing an underground connection with the hot springs above. In one spot the hill of basins juts out with bold prominence and steep sides, at the top of which a bold stream of smoking water comes tumbling over. In places where the flow of water was greatest it was observed that instead of forming basins, the materials were deposited in the form of a cascade; and as the deposition appears to be uniform when the water, from finding some other outlet, ceases to flow, it leaves what may be described as an exact white *plaster cast of rippling water;* and so perfect is the imitation that in a photograph of the scene the eye is unable to decide which is running water and which solid stone. Hence the name "Frozen Cascade." The general effect may be described by imagining a thousand small-sized Niagaras, placed alongside and above and beyond each other, suddenly turned by a magic wand into solid white marble.

As we pass along the foot of this bold point we reach a spot where the water has broken out anew, within a comparatively recent period, and with its deposit overwhelmed a grove of trees growing upon some more ancient formation. The dead and decaying limbs stick out above the surface of the still forming deposit to tell how they were overwhelmed.

Picking our way through this grove, and tramping through the shallow spread of water which is warm to the feet, we turn towards the hill and commence to climb up its steep face, using the edges of dried or partially dried up basins as stepping stones, and crushing under our feet at every movement the beautiful crystal-like structure. At every few steps we pause to enjoy the ever-changing and always novel view presented to us. Each new view appears more charming than the last, as it brings in sight more water,

nearly every basin in this portion of the "cascade" being not only full but running over.

At length we reach the top, and stand at the same time upon the highest point of the terraced slope and on the edge of the corresponding plateau, the witnesses of a scene which it is thought few white men have ever enjoyed. The eye cannot take in with satisfaction at the same moment all the beauties presented, and, after gazing for a moment in silent wonder at the magnificent spectacle, I turn from the more beautiful part, as though desiring to leave that for the last, and picking my way along the very edge of the plateau, halt at a point where the whole hill is brought under the eye, and each successive white marble basin filled with bright blue water. The edges beautifully curved and scolloped stand out in relief, one beneath the other, down to the bottom of the hill; and then with a gentler slope the basins disappear in the grove of dead and dying trees at its foot. Such a sight amply compensates one for many a weary mile of travel, and yet it is not the finest we are to see. Turning around and stepping a few paces back from the edge of the plateau, we find ourselves standing upon the rim of an immense boiling caldron, some twenty feet across, or rather a series of caldrons, for there are several of them, divided by walls built up by themselves, through apertures in which the water flows off from one to the other.

The pool nearest to us is of a bright sky-blue color, and on the edge where it is still we look down into its clear depths to an unknown distance. We approach the edge with a cautious awe, for a false step or a weak spot in the rock would send one to certain death. Step by step we approach and peer over into the depths below. One naturally starts back in affright; for the rock, growing thinner and thinner as it approaches the edge of the water, projects over as it rises, and the water is so very clear and pure that we seem to be standing suspended in mid-air. Closer examination shows the rock perfectly solid and firm; and now, becoming bolder we proceed to a more minute inspection.

The projecting edge rests just at the surface of the water. It is formed of beautifully undulating curves, and these are tipped with a series of pure porcelain-like pieces shaped like finger-nails. These are as hard as flint, as sharp on the outer edge as a knife, and so firmly attached to the rocky edge as to require a sharp blow with a hammer to detach them. This peculiar scolloped edge extends all around the pools.

Near by us is one of the partition-walls, through a break in which, highly colored with rich red and brown, the water flows into the neighboring pool, changing its blue tint into a rich brown or saffron. The color is not constant, but varies as the waters

intermingle, so as to give almost every conceivable tint, and the variations are still further increased by the waters mingling with those of a third pool deeply tinged with yellow from the sulphur held in solution by the water which supplies that pool.

Now imagine all these pools boiling and bubbling in the centre, sending their little tiny waves surging to the edge, splashing up under the porcelain-scolloped edges, a white mist rising from the whole, the play of all these colors in a bright sunlight, and some faint conception may be formed of the sight.

Words are weak in any attempt to describe the picture, and the photograph makes no record of the colors, to which even the skilful painter's brush fails to do full justice. A most admirable picture of the scene I have attempted to describe has been painted by Moran, and was some time ago on exhibition at Shay's, on Broadway, New York. The same artist painted the view of the Great Falls of the Yellowstone, which was put up at the head of the Senate stairway in the Capitol. These falls we shall visit as we prolong our rambles in the Rocky Mountains.

We linger in admiration around these beautiful pools, noting the splendid play of the colors, and finding new beauties at every step. Apparently there is no living thing in the water, but where it runs off from the pools to dash itself into the basins beyond, there is deposited at the bottom of the channels a sort of vegetable substance, as fine and soft as silk, which clings to the rock, and waves back and forth in the rippling water like long feathery plumes. On these long plumes the water deposits a part of its coloring matter, and the effect as they sweep gracefully from side to side in the running water, flashing up their rainbow hues, is indescribably beautiful. All the way down the slope these colors can be traced, growing fainter and fainter as they near the bottom.

We turn our backs with regret upon this beautiful view, returning to it again and again afterwards, to gaze in wonder at a scene which changes and seems to present new charms at every new position of the eye, and at every new angle at which the sunlight strikes it.

We now climb terrace after terrace and reach plateau after plateau, all old, worn out, and disintegrated. Soil has been formed upon them, great trees are growing on them, and patches of grass and bright flowers are scattered about. This is the scene of the operation in former times of just such springs as those we have seen below, but now nothing more than a remnant of their working remains. Here a deep hole is encountered, up through which the sound of gurgling waters reach the ear; there a small vent through which hot steam issues forth.

Wandering along, we come suddenly upon a structure which at

once arrests the attention. In the midst of a clump of large pine trees, and with some small dead ones imbedded in its surface, stands a rocky structure six or eight feet high, say twenty feet long and half as broad, looking like a great rough jelly-mould turned upside down. From the top and down the sides of this are running in every direction little streams of water, depositing their rocky material and building the mound still higher and broader, as they have been building it probably for thousands of years before Columbus told the world there was such a place as America. We climb upon the top of this oval-shaped mound, and find along the axis of its length a row of apertures of all sizes, from that of a quill to one of an inch in diameter, and from each one of these steam mingled with hot water is rushing forth with a noise which threatens to blow the whole structure to pieces. Each aperture is surrounded with delicate little porcelain finger-nails, beautifully colored; and the mingling of sounds produced by the hissing steam, has suggested the name which has been given to this singular spot, "The Beehive." An engine whistle placed over one of the vents of "The Beehive" might well impress the visitor with the idea that the iron horse had invaded these solitudes.

Our rambles at length brought us to the foot of a high steep bluff, covered with dense timber, where we were shown into a cave excavated by water trickling from above. We crawled down into it, enjoyed the cool atmosphere, lit a candle brought along for the purpose, and gazed in admiration at the thousands of stalactites and stalagmites which flashed back their rays to us. The formation of the rocky structure in which the cave was hollowed out was the same as that about the springs below. In fact the whole valley, four miles long and from two hundred yards to a mile and a half broad, is filled with the same material which abuts against the solid rocks of the hills at the sides.

Returning we walked for half a mile or more along the top of a ridge, stretching like an immense backbone over the plateau, and formed evidently by the water boiling up through the top and depositing its material from openings which we passed at every step. The waters have long since found some outlet at a lower level, leaving the former channels now empty. At one point we came to a wide opening, down which we looked into a great cave some twelve or fifteen feet deep, where countless bats, disturbed by the sticks and stones we threw down, flew from side to side in wild dismay at their solitude being so roughly invaded. The materials of which this great backbone is made are evidently identical with the hot springs deposit. They rest in layers, and the slightest break serves to show the manner in which the deposit was made. The rippling of running water is still there, but with none of the

freshness of the recent formation lower down the valley. In fact nearly all this portion of the valley bears evidence of operations long since extinct. There was a time, however, when the disintegrating masses around us presented all the fairy forms and brilliant colors seen to-day at a lower level. Now quite a soil has formed on top, and in this are imbedded the roots of lofty trees. Taking into account the incalculable length of time which must have elapsed to form this great deposit, layer by layer, of almost inappreciable thickness, like leaves of paper piled one on top of the other, the period, after the water ceased to flow, required by disintegration and other causes to produce the soil necessary to support vegetation, and after that the time for these trees to grow up, one may form some vague estimate of the thousands of years which have probably elapsed since the active powers were at work on the space where we are now standing. Here and there a faint trace, as if a mere draining of the former system, exists in the form of a little pool, out of which boils water strongly impregnated with mineral substances, dyeing with beautiful colors the little basins which it seems to form as naturally as the leaves form on a tree or flower.

The number of charming views, beautiful forms, novel structures, and curiosities of all kinds to be seen here, seems to be limited only by one's amount of physical endurance; for whichever way we turn something new and strange is sure to meet the eye. Weeks might be spent in exploration, and every hour furnish a new wonder. Our time was limited to hours, and we found them only too short to explore the springs themselves, without attempting much in the surrounding country, which contains some magnificent scenery. From the top of the hill near the head of the valley, we obtained a fine view, which made us yearn to explore the deep cañons of the three forks of Gardner's River and the highlands intervening between them. Each of the three forks before reaching their junction in the valley below the springs, passes through a deep, dark, rugged cañon with almost perpendicular sides, and directly before us, far up on the eastern fork, we see a magnificent waterfall, with here and there a patch of snow, so hidden in the gorge that the warm August sun has not yet succeeded in melting it. Of this fall we shall obtain a closer view when we come to resume our rambles towards the Great Falls of the Yellowstone, but for the present we have to content ourselves with a distant one. Far off to the south of us can be seen great mountain peaks towering to the skies and covered with perpetual snow. These, we are told, are around the head-waters of the Madison, and with the wings of a bird we might reach in a few miles what on horseback will consume many difficult days' marching.

Making our way back down the valley we linger about the great hot spring, admiring anew its formation and colors, and as we pick our way down the steep slope we stop to examine an impromptu shower-bath, which some enterprising individual has improvised half way down the slope, where the water has cooled sufficiently to render parboiling improbable. A pretty little arbor of pine boughs has been constructed over one of the basins, in which a board seat has been placed. A wooden trough, with one end so placed against the bank above as to catch the water, conveys it so as to strike the neck and shoulders of a bather seated on the bench. We did not stop to try the bath, but since bathing in warm milk is considered the height of luxury, we can readily imagine what a bath here would be, especially since the bather, if dissatisfied with the temperature of the stream he was under, could satisfy the most fastidious taste by doing as the thermometer does—rising for more heat, falling for less.

Returning towards our bivouac, we met and conversed with some of the visitors, some thirty of whom, men, women, and children, are here for the benefit of the waters. They are taken both externally and internally, and one old man we saw seemed to have made a mistake, and fancying his stomach a bath-tub, was trying with all his might to fill it at the earliest possible moment with water a good deal hotter than any coffee ever drank in more civilized regions. He was seated by a spring with a quart can in his hand, with which he dipped up the boiling fluid and poured it down his throat as fast as he could swallow, stopping only now and then to lick his lips and utter a grunt of satisfaction. I looked at him in astonishment, and asked him if he liked it.

"Oh, yes," he replied, "it is better than any of your coffee, tea, or such truck."

On his invitation I tried it, and it is no exaggeration to state that the first mouthful scalded me; the second one, taken with the usual precautions, I managed to swallow, and did not try a third. The old man regarded me with that silent look of pity with which a habitué of Saratoga regards the first attempt of a novice to enjoy a glass from Congress spring. The water is strongly impregnated with sulphur and other substances, smells like an old hen-house after the setting season, and I have seen *iced* drinks I like better.

Most wonderful stories are told of the cures produced by these waters. Persons so weak as to be held on their horses to get here are in a short time strong enough to move about and take all sorts of exercise. There is no question that with easy means of reaching these springs, and accommodations for visitors on the spot, which last would soon follow the first, people would flock there from all

parts of the world. The route of the Northern Pacific Railroad, although not yet definitely decided, will, in all probability, go within seventy-five or eighty miles of the springs.

Returning to our bivouac, it was found that our poor horses and mules, tormented beyond endurance by the hordes of flies, had concluded to vacate the country, and seek less objectionable company lower down the river. Parties sent out in search of them found that, as is the custom of animals under such circumstances, they had taken the only route they knew anything about, and gone back on our trail. Rapid pursuit was made, but they were not overtaken till they had reached the cañon of the Yellowstone, some twenty-five miles away. Here the formidable rocky ascent before them probably caused them to pause just before they were overtaken. Had they succeeded in getting through the cañon we should in all probability not have overtaken them before they reached Fort Ellis, sixty-six miles away, which would have caused a serious delay in our ramblings towards the great lake and falls of the Yellowstone, for which we were to start in the morning. Additional precautions were, therefore, taken, and as it was out of the question to picket the animals in the daytime and find them alive at night, a man was detailed to watch them. So troublesome, however, were the flies that the poor creatures could not even eat during daylight, and occupied themselves in crowding together and rolling in the dust, to get rid of their pests. At night they had to be let loose to feed whilst their enemies were asleep, a few only being kept picketed in the best grazing ground, and with the hope that the rest would not desert them. This, however, proved a vain hope, and the horses, remembering how they suffered after the sun got up, concluded to get out of the way in time, and when daylight came all but those picketed were found to have disappeared.

In the western country when a man loses his horses the first thought is "Indians;" the last one "strayed." But here we were under no apprehension of Indians, for although they sometimes come as high up the Yellowstone as Boettler's ranche, they never, we were assured, visit this section of the country; although it is said there are near the lake region some few poor miserable wretches called "sheep-eaters," they are very seldom seen, and avoid, like any other wild beast, a white man. It is said, too, that occasionally wandering members of the Bannock tribe sometimes pass through the country, but they have a holy dread of it as closely allied with the infernal regions. It is stated to be a fact that should an Indian fail to return from this country, his tribe would never think of attributing his disappearance to murder, but would conclude, as a matter of course, that he had been swallowed up by one of the numerous hot springs or geysers, and gone straight through to

report to his Satanic majesty. This renders the passage of white men through the country pleasantly secure.

We therefore had no fears that Indians had "jumped" our stock, and at once made preparations to follow it. Several parties were started out, and as it is best under such circumstances not to stand on the order of going, but go at once, myself and another officer mounted our horses, and ascending the hills back of our camp proceeded to search for the trail. We found it at last, but the horses were then evidently feeding, and much time was lost following the tracks here and there over the dry hard ground.

After some perseverance, and a good deal of grumbling and hard words, we found the trail leading, in as direct a way as the broken nature of the country would permit, in a northeasterly direction towards the home trail. Down into deep ravines and up on to high hills we followed it, slowly picking our way along over the rough rocky places, until the tracks lead us into the plain well-beaten trail we had followed two days before. Here the footprints were plainly seen in the dusty road, and now commenced a more rapid pursuit, as the tracks could be easily seen whilst we were moving at a gallop. A stern chase is proverbially a long one, and we now pushed forward as rapidly as possible with the hope of overtaking our truant animals, at least before they reached the cañon. As we rose the top of each hill we strained our eyes with the hope of catching sight of them, but it was not until we came in sight of the "Devil's Slide" that we caught a glimpse of a single moving object, and that proved to be one of our mounted men going on the same mission as ourselves. We soon overtook him, dismounted to rest his weary horse, and taking the lead we pushed ahead in rapid pursuit. The "sign" freshened, and as the prospect of catching sight of our animals increased we increased our speed as much as the weary condition of our horses would permit. As we neared the gorge of the cañon hope faded away, for in the valley before us no living creature was to be seen. We reached the first rocky point, and picked our way slowly across it, knowing that if the animals once got across the next point we were destined to have a long chase indeed. We moved rapidly across the little valley, looking forward to a climb over the rocky slope before us, when, casting our eyes to the right, we were gratified with the sight of all our animals quietly cropping the rich bunch grass on a side hill. As we neared them they looked up with a quiet stare, which said as plainly as words, "Is it possible we are of so much importance that you would follow us twenty-five miles!" We quickly shifted the saddles from our tired horses to some of the estrays, and arming ourselves with long sticks we made those animals "*hump* it" back to camp in a way which was a sight to see. We made the twenty-five miles in

a little over two hours, hastily broke up camp, packed our mules, and left the beautiful "frozen cascades" behind us.

We followed across the country due south, crossed the middle fork of Gardner's River, a raging torrent up to our horses' girth, where the animals could scarcely keep their footing on the smooth round boulders which covered the bottom; struck the east fork, crossed that, and followed up its right bank by a steep game trail leading up the side of the valley. From a point on the steep side hill, where we stopped to take a drink from a little ice-cold spring which gushed from the rock, we had a splendid view of the Falls of Gardner's River, east fork, where the water makes a perpendicular plunge of sixty or seventy feet. Still toiling up the slope, we stand at length upon the flat horizontal ledge of rocks through a break in which, worn out by itself, the river makes its plunge.

Halting to rest, and turning back, a sight meets the eye which causes a burst of admiration from the whole party. Far down below us is the gorge through which we have just come; our pack-mules are still struggling up the steep pathway. Away off to the left and rear, rising one above the other, are the rocky broken hills surrounding the valley of the Hot Springs, here and there cloven with steep-sided openings for the passage of the branches of Gardner's River, whilst standing like a great white marble castle, in marked contrast with the dark foliage behind, is the prominent point in the "Frozen Cascade," glistening like snow in the bright rays of the now setting sun, a thin misty cloud of steam rising from its top. One might well linger in admiration over such a view, but the sun is fast sinking behind the western snowcaps, and we push on to find a pleasant camp in a grove of pines, with plenty of rich grass for the horses, bright clear water for them and ourselves, and a store of hard dry lodge poles for our fires. Years ago this must have been a favorite camping-place for Indians, for we find plenty of "tepic" poles, but all old, dry, and partially rotted under the rank grass which has grown up around and over them.

The next morning we encounter our first difficulty, for the trail becomes dim, and as no horsemen have lately passed over it we wander about for a long time searching for it in vain. We are now on the high rolling divide which separates the head-waters of Gardner's River from the Yellowstone, and have nothing to guide us but general directions and the fact that we know the Yellowstone lies to the east of us. We know, however, that one of Prof. Hayden's pack-trains has recently passed over the route, for we met it the day before, returning to Fort Ellis for supplies. If we can only strike its trail we will be all right. At length, after a search of several hours, we strike the broad fresh trail of the pack-train. With shouts our party is assembled, and we move confidently for-

ward again towards the Falls of Tower Creek, some eighteen miles away.

That our elevation is now considerable we can plainly see, for along the slope of a low range of hills to the south, long snow-drifts extending well down are glistening in the bright warm August sun. Away off to the eastward the broken rocky mountains on the right bank of the Yellowstone, cut up into deep dark cañons, are in full view, and we pass every now and then clumps of "quaking asp," whose roots are fed by moisture from the melting snow. The country has evidently once been a fine game section, but now, as we move along, we see nothing but a few antelope, which scamper away as fast as their fleet legs can carry them, evidently well acquainted with the crack of a rifle.

Our route leads us through some beautifully wild wooded valleys, and at length we stand on top of a hill looking once more down upon the Yellowstone. In the valley below us stands the first and only bridge which has ever yet spanned the virgin waters of the river. It was built by miners, to enable them to reach the gold diggings on the head-waters of Clarke's Fork, a stream which empties into the Yellowstone several hundred miles below the point where we are now standing. Our trail leaves this bridge to the left, and we follow it till it enters a thick and matted wood, where we meet with our first difficulty in the way of fallen timber. It lies in almost every possible direction, and we twist and turn in all ways to avoid it, sometimes losing the trail, and now and then encountering a hill so steep as apparently to preclude the idea of our pack-mules scrambling up it. Rising all the time, we reach the edge of an immense chasm, standing directly across our path. The trail seems to lead to the left across a rocky ledge, along the steep edge of which I follow until the view opens a little, and a cry of alarm escapes me as I call to the rest of the party to halt, and hastily spring from my saddle. My horse and I are standing upon a projecting ledge with scarcely room enough to turn round, and I have a sort of feeling that at length I have reached one of the *ends* of the earth. The spot is an overhanging ledge of rock, the disintegrating edges of which render it uncertain at what moment the whole thing may go toppling over into the depths below. You cannot get close enough to the edge to see the bottom of the abyss before you, and from it, far down below you, comes up the hoarse roar of falling waters. This is Tower Falls, so deep down in this great rent of the earth, and so surrounded by tower-shaped masses of rock, that from this point no sight of it can be obtained. The tops of great trees can be seen far, far below where we now stand. On the other side of a vast amphitheatre the steep, almost perpendicular, rock rises up for hundreds of feet, cut into all sorts of fan-

ciful forms by the action of water in former ages. At the foot of this wall, far off below us, the Yellowstone comes tumbling along with its characteristic sea-green color, here and there worked up into milk-white foam, as ledges of rocks interfere with the current. We are now looking into the very mouth—the lower opening—of the Grand Cañon, and its slopes near the water's edge are tinged with the bright colors which we are to see in all their glory at the other end of the cañon, some twenty-five miles above, to which point the Great Falls of the Yellowstone have worked their way back after, who shall say how many, centuries of labor.

The trail ends where we stand. There is no place for it to go, except into empty air. After gazing with that feeling of admiration and awe which a sight of magnitude and splendor always produces, I carefully picked my way back along the perilous ledge, and started to search for the trail which was to lead us down to the bed of Tower Creek. After a long hunt we found it, and commenced the descent by a path so steep that we had to dismount and lead our horses down. Down, down we go for hundreds of feet, passing by the tops of great trees, until we finally reach where their roots are imbedded in the banks of the creek, a foaming mountain torrent, rushing over a bed of boulders towards the falls below. Crossing this we turn down the narrow valley, and obtain a fine view of the "Devil's Den," a wild, narrow, dark gorge, through which the stream rushes boiling, to make its fierce leap before it mingles its waters with those of the Yellowstone far down below. The country is here exceedingly broken. Wild and beautiful high hills rise in every direction around the point where the two streams join, the inclosed space being also broken up with steep rounded hills, clothed in a luxuriant growth of grass, flowers, and trees. To the top of one of these hills we mounted, to enjoy a sight of the Tower Falls. The stream, after passing through the "Devil's Den," enters a still narrower gorge, with great pinnacle-shaped towers rising on each side, and, bending slightly to the right, plunges over a perpendicular precipice, fifty or sixty feet high, and in a sheet of foam strikes below with a roar, sending up clouds of cool spray, which makes the chasm below feel like an ice-house, compared with the heated air above. From a point lower down we get a side view, which, concealing the channel of the creek, makes the water appear as if plunging out of a hole in the solid rock. Far above is the projecting point of rock upon which we stood an hour ago, and we can now appreciate what a tumble a false step there would have given us.

The path down to the river is too steep for our horses, so, tying them to a tree, we pursue our way on foot, and climbing down to the very edge of the surging waters of the Yellowstone, put our

rods together, and prepare to test the truth of the assertion that the speckled trout from that stream will not take the artificial fly. We stand at the mouth of a little stream, whose warm water and sulphurous smell tell of hot springs near by, and no fish rise to our flies. We wander lower down, and where Tower Creek comes plunging in with a roar, forming eddies, which we feel sure must entice the trout to lie in them, we try again. I select a large brown-winged fly with yellow body, and scarcely has it touched the surface of a deep pool, just above the mouth of the creek, than a pair of jaws, large enough to take in your hand, opens at the surface of the water, and immediately my reel commences to sing and my rod to bend, as if a whale were tugging at the line. What with the trout's surprise and fright, and my eagerness, it is a hard struggle to land such a monster through the rushing torrent, but, at length, my fingers are in his gills, and the great fish, with spotted sides of the color of liquid gold, lies panting on the shore. Another and another soon follow him, and in a time entirely too short, we have a string of three and four-pound trout, enough to supply the whole party, and entirely too large to carry up the steep ascent behind us with any sort of comfort. Our camp is pitched in a little valley close by, where we enjoy our feast with travellers' appetites, and are lulled to sleep by that most delicious of all sounds to the sleepy senses, falling water, provided always it does not come in the shape of rain.

Our next day's trip was over a rough and rugged path. We first had to climb the rough, steep, and wooded slope which bounds the valley of Tower Creek on the south. Here one of our pack-mules slipped, fell, and got rid of his load, which had to be repacked. Then the country opened out into rolling prarie, and as we reached a high point a magnificent view was opened to us. The whole surface below us, as far as the eye could reach in every direction, was covered with dense masses of pine timber. On the left was the Grand Cañon of the Yellowstone, beyond which mountain rose beyond mountain, until in the far distance to the south peaks covered with perpetual snow appeared. On our right we could trace the deep cañon of Tower Creek running far to the westward, whilst to our front Mount Washburne (named after the late Surveyor-General of Montana, the first modern explorer of the wonders of the Yellowstone) rose up as if to bar our further progress south, its long sloping sides striped here and there with long deep snow-drifts. Along the northern face of Mount Washburne the trail led us over a rough country; now passing through dense masses of timber, now threading our way through intricate meshes of fallen trees, and now deep down into great gulches washed out by streams running from the melting snow-banks above, we at length reached

the top of a divide to the west of the peak, from which we looked down and over an immense wooded district, with the now far-famed Yellowstone Lake glistening in the distance. Here and there over the landscape rises a column of white steam, serving to remind us of the hot springs, geysers, and other wonders we have before us. We climb down the steep slope in front of us along a path well beaten by recent horse-tracks, and enter a pleasant region of thick timber, alternating with pretty little valleys well watered and covered with grass and flowers. In passing through one of these we missed the trail, and whilst searching for it came across a great bank of white plaster-of-paris-like substance, in which our horses sunk up to the fetlock. It was evidently a deposit similar to that made at the hot springs, and along its base sulphurous water was boiling up, and bubbles of gas rising through the stagnant pools.

Our directions were to follow along the southern face of Mount Washburne to obtain a fine view of the Grand Cañon and the Great Falls, and, as we were now fast leaving the mountain, we decided to halt for the night, and made camp in one of the bright little valleys alongside of a clear stream.

It being early in the afternoon, myself and a companion started out to search for the falls, and, guns on shoulder, we plunged into the deep forests. Our provisions were growing scarce, at least the fresh meat part, and we were not without hope of finding game of some kind. We proceeded, therefore, very carefully, walking lightly, and every now and then halting to listen. The stillness was almost oppressive, not even a breath of air seemed to break the monotonous quiet of the pine woods, when suddenly, as we rose the slope of a hill, and stopped as usual to listen, a startling sound broke upon the ear, of so singular a nature that we looked at each other in alarm. Again it sounded, with a dull sort of thud easily magnified into a growl.

"Listen; what is that?"

"A grizzly!" comes back in a hoarse stage whisper from my companion.

Now a grizzly bear is an awkward kind of an animal to meet sometimes, especially in a lonely wood with the only help within a hundred miles of you a mile or two away. The trees fortunately furnish one means of escape if resorted to in time, and we both instinctively picked out the most convenient one near. But neither of us contemplated such an ignominious retreat before an invisible foe, and now eyes and ears were eagerly bent in the direction of the sound, with the hope of obtaining some definite clue to its origin. For an instant it seemed to me that I was all turned into eyes and ears. Again and again did the sound come booming through the

otherwise silent wood, and in the absence of any bodily presence light commenced to break in upon our frightened senses. It was observed that the sound came at regular intervals, did not vary at all, and did not sound like the voice of an animal. This set us to thinking, and in a moment the woods resounded with a shout and a cry.

"It is a mud volcano!"

The mere suggestion was enough to carry conviction, and we pushed forward in the direction of the sound, as eager now to go forward as we had been before to go back. We travelled in this way for nearly a mile, the sound being our compass, and at last, pushing our way through a thick piece of wood, stood in an open space, on the far side of which rose a steep bare hill. At the base of this was a circular pool of dark muddy water in an active state of ebullition. At regular intervals, a few seconds apart, a column would shoot up from the centre of the pool to the height of six or seven feet, scattering the dirty-looking water in every direction, and giving out the sound we had heard. At every burst of the volcano the water would rise slightly and a little run off through a channel, the depth and worn appearance of which showed that the flow at some periods was much more copious than at present. Near by was another pool, but of clear water, and in place of shooting up like the other it was quietly boiling, the surplus water flowing off in a drain. The side hill above was filled with vents, from dozens of which hot steam and water hissed forth as though eager to escape from the pressure below. In one place, in a sort of pocket half filled with well-mixed mud, the steam bubbled through and reminded one of boiling mush.

We stood, long wondering at this singular spectacle, the sounds given forth from the vents in the side hill reminding one of those heard in a railroad depot when half a dozen engines are hissing forth steam from their partially closed valves.

As we turned to leave the place we quietly laughed at the recollection that we came very near taking to trees to avoid a mud volcano.

Continuing our ramble, and with our eyes now open for new wonders, we entered one of those pretty little prairie-like openings which seem to be so common here. Talking as we walked, and thinking only of the singular phenomenon we had just witnessed, I suddenly became aware of a great pair of bright eyes surmounted by a long pair of ears, both of which were turned eagerly towards us from the other side of a pile of dead trees lying one on top of the other not thirty steps from us.

"Stop! What is that?" and I had to look twice before I could make out that the eyes and ears belonged to the head of a deer,

whose body was concealed by the pile of fallen timber. Our camp was out of fresh meat. I was but an indifferent rifle-shot. If the deer ever made a spring she would expose her body, but in motion she would be safe from my bullet. These thoughts passed rapidly through my mind. As if by instinct, my rifle came down; a moment, and the woods resounded with a shot; and before my companion had even seen what caused my exclamation, the game disappeared behind the logs. A few steps forward, and there almost in the very bed from which she was startled by the sound of our voices, lay a fine fat doe with a bullet through her eye. Of course it was a splendid shot, of the William Tell order, and, of course, I accepted with becoming modesty all sorts of compliments about snuffing candles at fifty paces, etc.; but I could not conceal my exultation at our good luck, and exhibited an excitement entirely inconsistent with the aplomb of an old hunter.

The deer was quickly disembowelled, one leg cut off, and, shouldering this, the liver, and our two guns, we commenced a rapid movement towards camp, giving up for the time all hope of seeing the falls, and filled only with the idea of what a welcome sight we had for the rest of the party, and what a feast we should have when we got back. Oh, what a trip that was! I don't think I ever saw mosquitoes more numerous or more bloodthirsty. They swarmed around us in myriads, covering our faces, our meat, and our hands, and pushing in their bills wherever they could find an unguarded spot. We cut branches of trees to whip them off, but all to no purpose; for both of our hands were constantly occupied, and no sooner were they driven from one spot than they reappeared at another. But as night came on, and it commenced to grow cool, which it always does as soon as the sun sets, they gradually lessened their attentions, and allowed us to enter camp in triumph and comparative comfort. Our appearance was hailed with delight, and our little camp resounded with good cheer and merriment. This was the only deer we saw upon the whole trip, and although we saw plenty of "signs" of both deer and elk, we failed to catch even a distant glimpse of the animals themselves, and concluded that they, during the summer, resorted to the highest mountains, where, in the vicinity of the snows, they were comparatively safe from both heat and flies.

Seated around our bright camp fires we ate, drank, and were merry, planning our expedition to the Great Falls the next day, neither knowing nor caring for the disappointment in store for us.

MIRACULOUS POWERS IN THE TRUE CHURCH.

Supposed Miracles. An Argument for the honor of Christianity against Superstition, and for its Truth against Unbelief. By Rev. J. M. Buckley. New York: Hurd & Houghton, 1875, pp. 54. 8vo.

REV. MR. BUCKLEY'S pamphlet is the substance of a speech delivered by him in September last at the "New York Ministers' Meeting of the Methodist Episcopal Church." We place it at the head of our article, and shall review some of its statements, not because it is a production of any great merit; but because it seems to represent the opinions of that class of Methodists who pretend to be wiser and more enlightened than their fathers and their simpler brethren, and who would fain thrust out of sight the antiquated notions of their founder, though clinging tenaciously to his form of church government. Wesley's teachings, we can imagine them saying to themselves, are childish and superstitious, and can only provoke a smile from the advanced Protestantism of to-day; therefore, let them be dropped as noiselessly as possible. But his oligarchical system has in it the germs of wealth and power; and on that account it must be retained—let the disaffected[1] in the South and West grumble as they will, and cry out against the clerical yoke. Such, we fancy, is the guiding principle of those Methodist ministers who are trying to bring Wesleyan doctrine up, as near as possible, to the rationalistic level of the day, and by this show of liberality, on one hand, help to stifle the growing clamor for lay representation on the other.

Besides this general purpose, the immediate causes which gave origin to Rev. Mr. Buckley's address may be gathered from the pamphlet itself. Our readers must remember that not long ago Prof. Tyndall and some of his scientific friends or followers made a proposal that the efficacy of prayer should be submitted to the following test. Let two wards of a hospital be set apart; and let the patients in one be merely prayed for, while those in the other are treated as nature and science require. If after a sufficient trial the former are cured, it may be allowed that there is some reason for saying that prayer has power to set aside the laws of nature. This challenge, as silly as it was insolent, of which we have given the substance rather than the words, was flung in the faces of the gaping crowds who flocked to hear and applaud the British professor, who vends his materialism and thinly-disguised atheism under the

[1] The so-called "Methodist Protestants."

name of science. They were for the most part, if not all, non-Catholics, on whom their religion, such as it is, sits very lightly. The challenge was not, and could not have been, meant for Catholics, whose doctrine about prayer and miracles does not depend on private judgment or individual caprice, but is grounded on fixed, unchanging principles, as Prof. Tyndall very well knows. Of the Protestant clergy some few—it is to be hoped, though we are not aware of the fact—may have given at the time a rational Christian answer. But many others failed to do so, or rather did the contrary. Some of them were for accepting the test outright; others, more cautious, declined, unless a perfect parallelism of condition between the two sets of patients, as to age, temperament, previous history, etc., could be secured beforehand. Others finally yielded the point by maintaining that prayer obtains spiritual blessings *only;* and that, if offered for temporal advantages, it fails to procure them —though the very act of such prayer may be justly said to produce a beneficial effect on the mind and heart of him who offers it.[1] This last theory contradicts not only the whole history of Christ's Church upon earth, but also the uniform teaching of both Testaments, Old and New. All that need be said of it is, that it is a characteristic specimen of the results of private interpretation of the Bible.

The prayer-test was not accepted; and this fact, especially when backed by such motives for refusing, must have furnished, no doubt, abundant matter of merriment, scoffing, and probably triumph, to the disciples of Materialism. It provoked, likewise, some disaffection and complaint in the Evangelical camp, on the part of those who thought it a pity and a shame that they had not been allowed to enter the lists, and with the aid of Heaven despoil the scientist Dagon of his boasted trophies,

> And with confusion blank his worshippers.

Among these, or their representatives, was a godly Methodist, Rev. Smith H. Platt, who had all along been a believer in the miraculous power of prayer. He had, indeed (apparently before the Tyndall challenge), been "cured," according to his own statement, of a rheumatic affection in the knees by the prayers of one Dr. Cullis, of Boston. But the next day he overtasked his strength, and relapsed into his infirmity. Yet this did not in the least destroy his faith in the prayers of Dr. Cullis, and in the reality of the cure effected by him. Let us listen to his own explanation:

"The next morning (after the over exertion) there was no essential change for the better, and I concluded at once that the Lord had

[1] Supposed Miracles, pp. 46, 47.

healed me in honor of the Doctor's faith, but that he did not want me to be well, and, therefore, permitted me to overdo and bring back the difficulty." (Ibid., p. 37.)

This sounds very strange, to say the least of it. The Lord doing and then undoing His work, healing and forthwith making sick again! And why this change in the Divine counsel? Was it to punish Mr. Platt because his faith had abated since the cure, or because he had not been sufficiently thankful for the blessing vouchsafed him? Not at all. Nor would any Christian reader ever imagine the cause, unless Mr. Platt had been pleased to make it known. God, he says, wished him to be lame, that he might have leisure to write certain books, which he never would have written had he enjoyed the perfect use of his limbs. The reader will naturally ask, what was the character of these books, so valuable to the cause of God and Religion, that Divine Providence should undo its own miraculous work, to compel Mr. Platt to write them. The answer involves nothing short of downright blasphemy, and lest we should be suspected of exaggeration we prefer to give it in Mr. Buckley's words:

"Concerning two of these books, it may be said that *they are unfit for circulation;* and must have been the product of a mind abnormally excited on *subjects* usually, as far as possible, *excluded from the thoughts of decent people.*" (p. 39.)[1]

But though lamed for this high and holy purpose, Mr. Platt felt confident that a day would yet come when a triumphant answer to the Tyndall challenge would be given in his person. And, if we are to believe him, the day came at last. It was Sunday, July 25th, 1875, at Ocean Grove, N. J., where Miss Mossman, whom he had never seen before, called to visit him, and announced that the Lord had sent her to see and heal him. She touched his knee, prayed, and then declared him healed; but in spite of her declaration the pain returned on Tuesday, and repeatedly at intervals, until at last (he says), after long and desperate internal struggles, a permanent cure was effected.

Though such bungling and jugglery need no refutation, Mr. Buckley takes some pains to prove that Mr. Platt has not made out his case; indeed, this seems to have been one of his chief objects in writing the address. We shall certainly not follow him through the details, nor through his discussion of other late miracles, pretended to have been wrought by Adventists, Mormons, Spiritists, and other impostors outside of the Church. There must

[1] Are these the literary amusements of Methodist ministers in good standing, members, and preachers (as was Mr. Platt), at Annual Conferences? Mr. Buckley has no difficulty in avowing that he has had a very pleasant acquaintance with Mr. Platt, and has esteemed him highly during the last nine or ten years.

be, in spite of three centuries of "enlightenment," a vast amount of gross credulity and superstition among Protestants, when they are found giving serious attention and firm belief to such shallow miracle-mongers. But it is the fate of those who disobey St. Paul (II. Thess. xi : 14), and reject apostolic tradition, to fall into the belief of "old wives' fables." They will not believe the miracles of God in His saints, and are condemned in just punishment to swallow any lying wonder that presents itself, any idle tale or absurd story, as the poet says,

> "of prophecies,
> And of a dragon and a finless fish,
> A clip-winged griffin . . .
> And such a deal of skimble-skamble stuff
> As puts one from his faith—"

if not in the true Gospel of Christ, surely in its sixteenth century counterfeit. We prefer to examine Rev. Mr. Buckley's notions about the purpose of miracles, and the duration of the miraculous power in the Church, as this will give us an opportunity of stating the Catholic, which in this as in everything else (much as our Protestant friends may doubt it) is the Scriptural view of the question.

Why are miracles wrought? Rev. Mr. Buckley, with an eye to his main purpose, answers thus adroitly:

"The purpose of divine miracles, comprehensively stated, is to demonstrate that *God speaks*. *This purpose* is well expressed in the words of Nicodemus, 'Rabbi, we know that thou art *a teacher* come from God, for no man can do these miracles that thou doest except God be with him.' . . . . While it (a miracle) would be highly unreasonable without a purpose, it would be most reasonable with the purpose of obtaining a proper hearing for *a divine teacher*, and it was the only means by which he could obtain a hearing at once. And miracles accomplished *their purpose*. Christianity got a foothold in the world, and has kept Judaism a permanent dwarf, destroyed Paganism on the continent of Europe, and in many parts of other continents, made the New World technically a Christian hemisphere, etc." (pp. 7–8.)

The words we have italicized show the way, more artful than honest, in which the writer passes over from the general to the particular, *a dicto simpliciter ad dictum secundum quid*, as logicians say. Miracles prove, indeed, that God speaks; but Divine speech is manifold. Sometimes it teaches, sometimes it commands; at other times it warns, rebukes, threatens, or condemns; at others it is meant only to consóle, encourage, or reward. And all these voices from the thunder tones of Sinai down to the light, gentle sound heard by the prophet (*sibilus auræ tenuis*, III. Kings xix : 12) with their accompaniment of miracles, may be traced in the pages

of inspired history. Since, then, God speaks through His miracles in so many ways, why does Rev. Mr. Buckley limit them to *one* form of speech, viz., the teaching or revealing of new doctrines? His mode of reasoning is, to say the least, unfair; but his object is clear. He would make out that miracles in the New Law were intended only to establish Christianity, and this end accomplished, they must disappear. Yet, Holy Writ nowhere teaches that this is the only or even the chief end of miracles. It teaches the contrary.

Miracles, he says, without a purpose would be highly unreasonable, but it is equally unreasonable to assign or limit such purposes according to our caprice, or, still worse, to gain a point for religious prejudice. "Who hath known the mind of the Lord, or who hath been His counsellor?" (Rom. xi: 34.) It is at all times perilous to enter into the Divine counsels; but we may, by studying His works and their motives, as revealed by Himself, reason by analogy from them to His subsequent works, even when their motives are left unrevealed. This is the safest and most reverent way to investigate the "unsearchable ways" of God to man, by making Him, so to speak, His own interpreter. Let us, then, examine the Divine economy with regard to miracles in the Old Law, which was a prelude and type of the New. The great miracles of the burning unconsumed bush, the rod changed into a serpent, the leprous hand, still more the plagues of Egypt, the passage of the Red Sea, the cloud by day and pillar of fire by night, the manna from Heaven,—all these may be regarded as miracles intended to prepare the Jews to believe that God spoke on Sinai, and that Moses was His accredited messenger and prophet. They were necessary to establish the Law of Moses, to wean the chosen people from all relics of idolatry, to force upon Israel the conviction that "the Lord, He is God, and that there is no other besides Him" (Deut. iv: 35). They were meant to surround with solemn glorious testimony the covenant, that the Lord our God made with His people in Horeb, when He spoke to them face to face out of the midst of fire, with Moses as mediator between them (ib. v: 2, 4, 5). The Mosaic Church may be regarded as established from the day of that covenant, or from its renewal in the land of Moab (ib. xxix: 1). After that the worship of the true God alone existed among the Israelites, bound up as it was with their daily life, political, social, and domestic. The idolatry of their ancestors from beyond the river had totally vanished; and the son of Beor, among the blessings forced from his reluctant lips by Divine agency, had to acknowledge that "there was no idol in Jacob, no image-God to be seen in Israel," no soothsaying or other superstitious practice, flowing from idolatry, to be met with among the people of Jehovah (Num. xxiii: 21, 23). But did this bring about the cessation of

miracles? If their only purpose had been to prove that God spoke as a teacher, and that Moses was His legitimate envoy, they had accomplished their end. Any repetition of them, therefore, would be without a purpose, and consequently unreasonable, as Mr. Buckley says. But this theory is repugnant to the whole history of the Old Testament. Miracles continued even after the Israelites had set foot in the land of promise; and the reasons why they were wrought are either explicitly mentioned, or may be clearly deduced from the narrative.

I. Even their very entrance into the land of their new inheritance was miraculous, the prodigies of the Red Sea having been renewed in the waves of the Jordan. The object of the miracle was, not to convince them that God had spoken through Moses, but that Josue was his legitimate successor, that the Lord was their protector, and that He would fulfil His other promises and dispossess their enemies of the land. It was also to be a warning to the heathen, and an encouragement to Israel to persevere in the service of the one true God. "This day will I begin to exalt thee before Israel, that they may know that, as I was with Moses, so I am with thee also. . . . . By this you shall know that the Lord, the living God, is in the midst of you, and that He shall destroy before your sight the Chanaanite and the Hethite, ... that all the people of the earth may learn the most mighty hand of the Lord, that you also may fear the Lord your God forever" (Jos. iii: 7, 10; iv: 25). The great wonder (which stands without a parallel in sacred history) of the sun and moon arrested in their heavenly course, was intended to show that God was pleased to obey the voice of a man (*obediente Deo voci hominis*) who should be His friend and servant, and that He fought for Israel (Jos. x: 7, 14). During the period of Judges, from Aod down to Samuel, the frequent miraculous interpositions of Providence were designed to save the repentant Jews from their enemies, and to convince them that God alone was the author of their prosperity, and the false gods not only unable to save them, but the source of their calamities. The victory of Gedeon and his three hundred was given expressly to teach Israel that they were delivered from Madian by God, and not by their own strength (Judges vii: 2). All these were so many protests, if we may so call them, on the part of God against the tendency to defection on the part of His people, and signal encouragements to those who remained faithful to the Mosaic law. In the days of Saul, David, and Solomon, notwithstanding the evil example of the last towards the end of his life, public worship flourished and was in no danger from schism or idolatry. Hence, during this period, we find that the miracles publicly wrought were few in number, compared with those of Josue and Judges. But after the death of Solomon, when the

kingdom was rent by the schism of Jeroboam, we find miracles multiplied both in Israel and in Juda, to rebuke the idolatry prevalent in the former, to sustain the constancy of those who even there were faithful among the faithless, and would not bow the knee to Baal, and to encourage the orthodox who dwelt under the rule of the descendants of David. This renewal of miracles began in the days of the chief seducer of the people, Jeroboam; it blazed forth with increased lustre in the glorious thaumaturgy of Elias and Eliseus; its flashes lit up the gloom of the Babylonic captivity; and even in the last epoch of Judaism shed a halo over those faithful patriots who fought and bled to save their country and religion from the idolatrous yoke of the Syrian.

II. Besides these miracles wrought for the defence and preservation of the Mosaic law, long after it had been established, we find recorded many others, the sole object of which seems to have been to enforce respect for sacred persons and things, and to punish the sin of sacrilege. Such were the cases of Mary, stricken with leprosy; of the seditious Core, Dathan, and Abiron, swallowed up alive by the abyss; of the two hundred and fifty laymen who presumed to handle the censer; of their fourteen thousand rebellious adherents slain by the pestilence; and of Achan stealing from the consecrated spoils of Jericho (Num. xii: 10; xvi: 33, 35, 49; Jos. vii: 11). To these we may add the casting down of Dagon by the Ark, the plagues brought by it upon Azotus, Gath, Accaron, and the Bethsamites; Oza slain by God for what might seem almost pardonable irreverence (I. Kings, v: 4, 6, 9; vi: 19; II. Kings, vi: 7). Two kings, Saul and Ozias, presume to invade the sanctuary and usurp the priestly functions; forthwith one, by divine sentence, forfeits his kingdom; the other becomes a leper till the day of his death (I. Kings, xiii: 14; II. Paralip., xxvi: 21). Passing over Antiochus and Heliodorus—models and precursors of the unholy kings and nobles of our epoch, in their crime and its chastisement—we have in the New Testament the unhappy fate which, by miracle, overtook two Christians, Ananias and Saphira—not to impress Gospel teaching on Jews or Gentiles, who may never have learned the facts—but evidently to teach Christians to respect St. Peter and abhor sacrilege (Acts v: 2–11). And all these miracles, as they were wrought, so too they have been put on record for a purpose. It is to warn and rebuke; and, if that be unavailing, to rise up in judgment and condemn those who, claiming to have no guide but the Bible, have come at last to believe that there is no such sin as sacrilege.

III. The miracles hitherto spoken of were public, and as such might have some indirect influence on the propagation and maintenance of an established religion. But many likewise are recorded,

that took place in private, and were performed solely for the benefit of individuals. They were special tokens of affection, if we may so call them, on the part of God; meant only for His chosen servants and friends. They brought back in some measure the blissful days of Eden, when God walked in the garden and held friendly, familiar converse with our yet innocent first parents. Of this character were the frequent apparitions of the Lord to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who were full of faith and needed no miracle to confirm it. Even if they did, one would have been sufficient. In one of these apparitions we behold Abraham, with the freedom of a privileged friend, beseeching and actually prevailing on God no less than six times in succession to change His counsel with regard to the doomed cities of the plain (Gen. xviii: 23–32). If we call it a miracle, when God alters or suspends the laws of nature, how much more applicable is the name, when the creature by a word moves the Creator to alter His fixed purpose and decree? And what was the object of these miracles? To give a proof of God's love for Abraham; and obviously at the same time to teach men, how powerful with God is the intercession of His saints. Let us recall here the case of Gedeon, who, after having been told by God that he was appointed to deliver Israel from Madian, asked in proof a miracle, and was convinced, as he himself confessed, when he saw the devouring flame evoked from the rock by the tip of the angel's rod. "Alas, my Lord God! I have seen the angel of the Lord face to face."[1] Yet, firmly believing as he did, he again demands a miracle, namely, that a fleece stretched upon the ground by night should receive the falling dew, while all around remained dry. His prayer is heard; for, rising early next morning he beholds the ground dry and the fleece alone saturated with dew. This ought to have satisfied even an unbeliever. But Gedeon—with what we should, humanly speaking, consider almost unpardonable importunity—is not satisfied, and seeks further proof. He demands that the miracle be repeated in a contrary sense; that the fleece remain dry, while the earth around it is bedewed with moisture. And the God of all mercy, instead of being wroth or reproaching him, works the miracle (Judges vi: 36–40). Here were two miracles quite useless, according to the non-Catholic theory, not wrought for the estab-

[1] It was believed by the Fathers, generally, down to St. Augustine, that the "angel" who appeared so often in the Old Testament, was no other than the Eternal Word, the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, under the form of an angel. Some have caught up eagerly this opinion, thinking thereby to damage our Scripture argument for the *cultus* due to angels. But all to no purpose. Even were Scripture silent, which it is not, tradition would suffice, as it has sufficed to establish the obligation of the Lord's Day. Unless the early Christians honored the angels, the Pagan Celsus would never have accused them of adopting angel-worship. He meant the supreme worship which is given to God, but his misrepresentation of the practice proves its existence.

lishment of religion, but to gratify what seems at first sight idle curiosity or sinful importunity on the part of Gedeon. Had any such miracles been registered in the lives of our saints, what a welcome theme of jest and mockery to the anti-Catholic world! Why they were wrought in this special form, and what they were intended to teach, is well known to the Catholic Church, who alone has the key of lawful interpretation.[1] What shall we say of the miraculous stream that issued from the jaw-bone of an ass to refresh the valiant son of Manue, when wearied with thirst and fatigue after the slaughter of God's enemies (Judges xv : 19); or of David's choice of evils, offered him from heaven by the prophet Gad (III. Kings xxiv : 12); or of Solomon's gift of long life, riches, glory, and wisdom, because he had desired the last alone without any thought of the others (III. Kings iii : 11–13). What had these supernatural occurrences, which were unseen of men, to do with the establishment of religion? Again, amongst the miracles recorded of Elias and Eliseus, how many of them were performed without witnesses and solely for the benefit of individuals? Such were the wonders wrought on behalf of the Sareptan woman in a Pagan land by Elias, on behalf of the prophet's wife and the Sunamitess by Eliseus; to which may be added the daily provision of bread and flesh brought by ravens to the holy Thesbite in his hiding-place near the torrent of Carith (III. Kings xvii : 6, 16, 22; IV. Kings iv : 3, 7, 17, 35). Such, too, was the miracle wrought privately by Isaias in the bed-chamber of the sick Ezechias (IV. Kings xx : 5, 11). And the counterpart of all this may be found in the New Testament, where angels, unseen of men, either ministered to Christ in the desert with heavenly food after His long fast, or consoled Him in His agony in the garden (Matth. iv : 11; Luke xxii : 43). Never should we have known this, had He not been pleased to reveal it to His inspired historians for our edification and instruction. Many miracles, likewise, are related in the Old Testament, in which individuals were punished without any intervention of witnesses. Examples of this may be found in Baalam (Num. xxii : 28, 31), when his eyes were opened to see the angel threatening with his sword, or when he was rebuked in rational speech by the dumb beast on which he rode; in the wife of Jeroboam (III. Kings xiv : 6, 12) whose disguise could not hide her from the blind prophet Ahias, and who returned to her threshold bearing the message of death to her child, whom she had sought

[1] "Quando natus es ineffabiliter ex Maria Virgine, tunc impletæ sunt scripturæ: sicut pluvia in vellus descendisti ut salvum faceres genus humanum." "When Thou wast born of the Virgin Mary, after an ineffable manner, the scriptures were fulfilled. Like dew Thou didst descend upon the fleece to save the human race." Anthem at Vespers and Lauds of the Circumcision, 1st of January.

to save by her secret visit to the man of God; in Giezi (IV. Kings v: 27) punished with leprosy for a sin known to none in Israel but himself and his master Eliseus.

It is evident, then, from Holy Scripture of the Old Testament that there are other purposes, besides the establishment of religion, for which God may work miracles. And if He did it under the Old, why should He not do it under the New Dispensation? Is the arm of the Lord shortened? Has He less at heart the maintenance of the revelation made through His only begotten Son, than the upholding of that, made through His servant and creature Moses? Is sacrilege less offensive to Him in the New Law than it was in the Old? Or are His chosen friends, who walk in the brightness of Christian faith, less dear to Him, less privileged to enjoy and dispense His bounty, than those who lived under the shadowy gloom of types and figures? There is, surely, nothing in the New Testament, nothing in the teaching of Christ or His Apostles, to warrant any such conclusion. On the contrary, our blessed Lord has positively declared, that any one not staggering in his heart but having the faith of God and believing that whatsoever He shall say shall be done, shall have his wish accomplished, were it even to raise mountains from their place and cast them into the sea. (Mark xi: 22, 23.) Again, He promises that every believer shall be enabled to do the same wonderful works that He has done, and even more wonderful (*majora horum faciet*) than those wrought by his own divine hand. (John xiv: 12.) There is here no limitation of time, place, person, or nature of the miracle.

"Christianity destroyed Paganism on the continent of Europe," says Mr. Buckley. But when? Not in the days of the Apostles nor of their immediate successors. He does not seem to be aware that a good portion of Pagan Europe was not comprised within the Roman Empire, and that even the Paganism within its limits was not destroyed immediately upon the appearance of Christianity. The Goths were converted only in the fourth century of our era; the Scotch, Irish, and Southern Picts, by their respective Apostles, Saints Palladius, Patrick, and Ninian, towards the middle; the Franks at the close of the fifth century. After the middle of the sixth century the Northern Picts received the faith at the hands of St. Columba; and, not long after, the Britons of Armorica were converted by St. Paul of Leon. In the seventh century the Angles and Saxons of England were brought to the knowledge of Christianity by Paulinus, Mellitus, and other envoys of Pope St. Gregory the Great or his successors; and, not long after, missionaries, English and Irish, were deputed for the conversion of Friesland and Franconia. The same century also witnessed the conversion of great part of Flanders by St. Eligius of Noyon, and of

Bavaria (A.D. 699) by St. Robert of the royal house of France. In the next century the English Apostle and Martyr, St. Boniface, planted the faith in Hesse, Thuringia, and part of Saxony; St. Virgil, an Irish bishop, in Carinthia; St. Adelbert in Holland; and another Englishman, St. Willebald, had the happiness of seeing the Saxons, among whom he labored, all converted to Christianity before his death. In the ninth century Moravia and Bohemia, with the Sclavonians and Bulgarians, received the light of the gospel; while the first attempts were made to convert Denmark, Sweden, and Northern Germany. The next century added to the Church Prussia, Hungary, Poland, and Polish Russia; and the good work previously begun in Northern Germany, Gothland, and Sweden was successfully continued by the labors of St. Adalbert and the English Saint, Sigfrid. About the same time Russia was purged of its idolatry by the pious zeal of Queen Olga (or Helen). Its first faith was Catholic or Roman; and those writers, among whom are even Catholics, who imagine that it renounced Paganism only to take up the schismatical creed of Byzantium, are much mistaken, as has been proved by the learned Bollandists, Henschenius, Papebroke, and Stilting. In the eleventh century Norway became almost entirely Christian, owing to the English missionaries brought over by the holy King St. Olave; and the conversion of Sweden was completed by the preaching of Saints Ulfrid and Eskill. It was only in the twelfth century that Pomerania and Finland were rescued from the darkness of idolatry, the former by St. Otho, the latter by St. Henry, Archbishop of Upsal.

Thus, it appears, nearly twelve centuries, or more than half the Christian period, elapsed before Paganism was destroyed in Europe. Were those idolatrous nations converted by mere preaching, without miracles? Certainly not. If signs, as the Apostle says, are meant for unbelievers, Christianity could have been established among them in no other way. Why should they so readily believe a mere man, who came to teach them a new religion unknown to their fathers and hateful to human nature, and to overthrow the old one, which was intimately bound up with their education, traditions, political and domestic life? Were they to yield in his case, in a matter involving (as it often did) life or death, to a mere αυτος εφα which they would not submit to from the wisest of their own in the ordinary transactions of daily life? If miracles had been necessary for the establishment of Christianity in the Roman Empire, why should the fiery Celt, the warlike Teuton, the fierce Hun and Sarmatian be denied that proof, which had been so freely accorded to the effeminate Greek and the degenerate offspring of Romulus? Were the pagan prejudices of the dwellers on the Rhine and Baltic less inveterate than those of the refined populations that

clustered round the blue waters of the Mediterranean? The historians of these converted nations bear witness to the miracles wrought for their conversion; and we have no more right to withhold our assent from their testimony, than we could have to deny that Pepin ousted Childeric from the royal palace of France, or that the brutal William of Normandy conquered the Anglo-Saxons on the battle-field of Hastings.

But, besides the necessity of miracles to convince pagans amongst whom Christianity is preached, the other reasons, for which God worked miracles in the Old and New Law, still subsist and put it out of a rational man's power to deny that miracles may continue down to the end of time. We have enumerated those reasons above, not imagining nor inventing them, but giving the authority of Holy Scripture, in which they are either expressly stated or clearly implied. Man changes, but God does not change. He is, as His Apostle tells us (Hebr. xiii: 8), "yesterday and to-day, and the same forever." *Mirabilis Deus in sanctis suis*, says holy David (Ps. lxvii: 36). Why should He not be wonderful in His saints now, as He was of old? Why should He not condescend even now, as He did in the case of His servant Josue (Jos. x: 14) to obey the voice of man, who makes himself worthy of His love, and enter the lists with His omnipotence to do battle for His Israel of the New Law? Is not reverence for holy persons, places, and things as essential now, as it was under the shadowy ritual of Moses? Or has sacrilege, which was such an awful crime in the Old Law, dwindled down to a venial trifle, needing no chastisement, in the New Dispensation?[1]

Rev. Mr. Buckley claims (p. 14) that he has "proved to a demonstration" that miracles no longer exist. It is worth while to examine this "demonstration." In the first place he tries (what he himself admits to be no easy matter) to "prove the negative" by an illustration.

"There are many caves and chasms in the mountain regions of our country not yet explored. Yet any one is authorized to affirm, that there is not in the United States a single living mastodon and that the species is extinct. So, though we cannot explore every cave and crevice of history, we can furnish conclusive and irresistible proof that miracles have ceased" (p. 8).

---

[1] See the Protestant writer, Sir Henry Spelman, in his History and Fate of Sacrilege, a work written and published nearly two hundred and fifty years ago, and since reprinted (a fac-simile copy of the original edition) by two Protestant clergymen (London, 1846). The domestic annals of fully one-half the noble families of Great Britain painfully attest God's vengeance on the crime of sacrilege. Even in our country we have had examples of the chastisement dealt by God's hand to those who made light of His warning words "Nolite tangere Christos meos."

This is simply no illustration at all, for it does not touch the point in question. It is well understood that the fossils of one period do not reappear in another; and all naturalists agree that the *mastodon* species is extinct. But all Christians do not agree that miracles have ceased. The far greater portion of the Christian world in our own day thinks differently; and so thought the whole Christian world for fifteen consecutive centuries. Miracles have been recorded by Christian historians and universally believed. If doubts have ever arisen, it was the character of the witness, not the possibility of the fact, that was called in question. We will try to give an illustration far more to the point than Mr. Buckley's. The Dodo (or Dronte), a gigantic bird of the genus *Didus* and of our own period, was found on the Island of Mauritius by the Portuguese at the close of the sixteenth century. It was seen repeatedly afterwards by Dutch and other travellers or colonists, down to a late period in the seventeenth century (1678, or some say in 1697). Naturalists have now come to the conclusion that the species has become extinct; and skeletons of the bird, whole or partial, are jealously preserved in the museums of London, Paris, and Glasgow. Now suppose a party of travellers, men of integrity and versed in natural science, were to visit the unexplored wilds of Madagascar or Australia, and there come across a live specimen of the Dodo, would not the naturalists of Europe unhesitatingly reverse their decision? Would they shake their heads dogmatically and say, "No specimen of an extinct species can possibly be found." No. They would admit the facts unreservedly, after satisfying themselves that the travellers were men of character and competent to judge. And so it is with miracles. These are not fossils of the ante-Christian period; and when their existence is alleged, they must be met, not with *a priori* theories, but with an inquiry into the character of the witnesses.

Mr. Buckley's second proof is this: "In the great Lutheran Reformation and the contemporaneous movement in Switzerland, believed by Protestants to be a mighty struggle with Antichrist, none of the Reformers had the miracle-working power. Neither Luther nor Melancthon, Calvin nor Farel, Zwinglius nor Manuel, claimed to work miracles." To the other Apostles, who preached a new creed but wrought no miracles, he adds John Knox and John Wesley. Why did he not add those other immaculate Reformers of religion, Cranmer, Henry VIII., and his spotless daughter Elizabeth? If Methodism is a mere offshoot of the Anglican Church, or, as John Wesley maintained for more than fifty years, nothing but Anglicanism pure and renovated, why not throw in the founders of the English Church by the side of those of Germany and Switzerland?

Mr. Buckley's course of argument discloses the great secret of hostility to Catholic miracles. He seems to say, "You Catholics boast of your miracles; we, it is true, can show nothing of the kind. We claimed a divine commission to reform your Church, but when you asked us to prove our mission by miracles we had none to offer. But we have a safe refuge in the principle that miracles have ceased under the New Law. This renders our miracles unnecessary, and disproves yours." Does not this recall the fable of the fox, who wished to argue the rest of the tribe into sharing his loss? We may grant that the Reformers worked no miracles; but we cannot consent to be argued out of our own. Miracles were neither needed nor possible in the case of the Reformers. The change of religion was everywhere forced upon reluctant populations by covetous nobles and arbitrary princes by fire and sword, by crime; and in England, as Mr. Hallam admits, not without shame, by the aid of foreign mercenaries. Luther, of whose magnanimity we hear so much, shifted and shuffled, until he was sure of the material aid of Hutten, Franz Von Sickingen, Schauenberg, and other Franconian nobles. Zwingli attempted to coerce his Catholic fellow-citizens into the new religion by famine and bloodshed. Calvin had his theocracy, penal laws, prison, and the sword; and were he alive now and in power would burn Methodists as backsliders from Calvinism.[1] Would any man in his sober senses imagine that God gave miraculous power to those wicked men who, to say nothing of their opinions, relied solely on the arm of flesh?

But Rev. Mr. Buckley is mistaken in saying that the Reformers claimed no wonder-working power. They did not accord it to each other,[2] but some of them claimed it for themselves. Amongst others, Luther, says Sir William Hamilton (*Discussions on Philos.*

[1] John Wesley, amongst his other changes of creed, in 1770 renounced Calvinism and Antinomianism, to which his sect, as he said, "had leaned too much," and thereby incurred the wrath of the old-fashioned, rigid Methodists, the Jumpers, Whitefieldites, and the Lady Huntingdon tribe, whose chaplain (Hon. and Rev. Mr. Shirley) wrote that Mr. Wesley's change, or as he called it, "dreadful heresy," had ruined "the very foundations of Christianity."

[2] It is certain that no Reformer suspected another of being likely to work miracles. Zwingli believed Luther to be possessed by a legion of devils. Luther considered Zwingli and his Zurichers as not only liars but falsehood itself. (Letter to Probst, June 1st, 1530, in De Wette, III., 26.) He looked on them as already damned, as given over to the devil (verteufelt, durchteufelt, uberteufelt, etc., on the first page of the Kurzes Bekenntniss of 1544). He used to call Bucer "a lying varlet." At Marburg he angrily addressed him in public as "Du Schalck und Bube!" And Sir William Hamilton says of Bucer, "Cat by name and cat by nature," he "consistently displayed himself guilty of mendacity in every possible degree." John Knox has been well styled by Dr. Johnson the "ruffian of the Reformation;" and even John Wesley cannot allude without horror to his "reforming mobs." (Wesley's Works, New York, 1850, vol. iv., p. 328.) Yet the same Wesley was the leading spirit of the riotous mobs of Lord George Gordon in 1780.

Literat., etc., Second Lond. ed., p. 505), had "an assurance of his personal inspiration, of which he was no less confident than of *his ability to perform miracles*." He boasted of having raised three persons from the jaws of death, one of whom was his Catharine Bore, another was the humbled and repentant Melancthon at Weimar. He tells also of a gracious rain produced by his prayers, and gives day and date, June 4th, 1532 (Tischreden, Frankfort, 1567, f. 191). Luther believed that nothing could be refused to his earnest prayer; and that were he to ask seriously for the destruction of the world, nothing more would be required to precipitate the advent of the last day (Sir William Hamilton, ibid.). John Wesley, who denied that he had miraculous gifts, is not always consistent with himself. He speaks more than once of miracles, obsessions, diseases cured by his prayers, supernatural facts, which could not be naturally accounted for. These are scattered *passim* through his Journal. Take the case of John Haddon and his own (Works, V., 469). He admits the old Christian theory of miracles, and denies that "God has precluded Himself from working miracles in any kind or degree, in any age down to the end of the world. I do not recollect any Scripture wherein we are taught that miracles were to be confined within the limits of either the Apostolic or the Cyprianic age, or of any period of time, longer or shorter, down to the restitution of all things" (ibid., p. 328). He recognized the undoubted truth of the miracles wrought at the shrine of the Jansenist Paris, and said that one might as well attempt to deny the existence of the city of Paris (Works, III., 473). So that Mr. Buckley does not present quite fairly the religious opinions of his founder.

Mr. Buckley alleges, as further proof (p. 12), the fact that miracles are not wrought (1) by Protestant missionaries; nor (2) by "the best men in all branches of the Church Protestant; those most conspicuous by their humble piety and self-denying labors; those most blessed of God in genuine revivals;" those men and women in different branches of Protestantism "who profess to be entirely consecrated to God, wholly sanctified, body, soul, and spirit." The man who alleges proof of this kind must either be very innocent himself, or presume too much on the simplicity of his readers. It is not necessary to read Herman Melville, Ida Pfeiffer, Commodore Wilkes, or Dr. Marshall's "Protestant Missions" to discover why Protestant missionaries work no miracles. Without recalling the memory of such unprincipled traders as the Gutzlaffs of China, or the Pritchards of Oceanica, we need only point to Rev. Mr. Smith and his brethren of our own Indian Agency. Is it from men of this stamp that miracles are expected? In the next place, if the "best men of the Church Protestant," in other words Protestant

saints, do not work miracles, does it logically follow that Catholic saints do not or cannot work them? Some might reason differently, and argue from the want of miracles to a want of sanctity. And surely, according to the Gospel, as well as Catholic teaching, men and women "who *profess* to be wholly sanctified, body, soul, and spirit," are not saints but Pharisees. The ante-Nicene Fathers, who testify to miracles, are dismissed by Mr. Buckley as worthless witnesses. He quotes, to their disparagement, passages from John Milton and John Wesley. Let Milton pass. He was a Socinian and (as Sir William Hamilton says), a polygamist in theory; no wonder that he "despised" the Fathers. But as to John Wesley, Mr. Buckley tramples on candor and honesty. In the very passage of Wesley referred to, after saying that he loves the Fathers in spite of some of their faults (and this is the passage Mr. Buckley triumphantly quotes), he goes on to say that one reason why he reveres them is because they were true Christians, and because they bore witness to the numerous miracles performed in their day. And this passage Mr. Buckley has suppressed. Here it is:

"I reverence them because they were Christians. . . . I reverence their writings, because they describe true genuine Christianity, and direct us to the strongest evidence of the Christian doctrine. Indeed, in addressing the heathens of those times, they intermix other arguments; particularly, that *drawn from the numerous miracles which were then performed in the Church, which they needed only to open their eyes and see daily wrought in the face of the sun.*"—(Works, vol. x., p. 76, Lond. ed., 1856; New York ed., vol. v., last page of Letter to Middleton.)

It would lead us too far to enter here into any detailed examination of the many illustrious miracles, related in the different ages of the Church, or even of a few of them. This has often been done by competent critics. Let the candid inquirer after truth investigate closely even one of these, weigh calmly the evidence in its favor, and, if it be proved, let him accept it, as he would any other fact of history. We ask him merely to do what we do ourselves, and admit no miracle for which the evidence is not satisfactory. But neither common sense, nor the Just Judge, will hold him guiltless who refuses to investigate on general grounds, such as the alleged cessation of miracles, the corruptions of the Church, etc. It was absurd, impious generalities of this kind (Matth. xii: 24; John ix: 16) that moved the Jews to reject the miracles of our Lord, and thereby fall into the unpardonable sin of blasphemy against the Holy Spirit.

GENERAL BANKS AS A HISTORIAN.

The Republic; will it endure? A Lecture delivered in Chicago and at other places, 1875 and 1876. By General N. P. Banks.

IF General Banks were merely a private citizen, appearing as such upon the lyceum platform, his utterances, however at variance with historical accuracy or violative of good taste, might be passed over in silence. But he is a gentleman whom many of his countrymen highly esteem for services in both the forum and the field. He has been honored for more than a quarter of a century with public station; and, as a representative in Congress from the historic State of Massachusetts, his public assertions necessarily carry weight for good or evil, and are entitled to candid, courteous, and impartial consideration. The fact that he has so frequently enjoyed public trust, is sufficient evidence of the readiness with which the mass of the people would heed what he might choose to say upon any theme which related to their interests. He was Speaker of the House of Representatives of Massachusetts in 1851. In the year following he entered the Congress of the United States, and became Speaker of the House in 1856, having served his constituency for five years with energy and distinction. Having been chosen Governor of Massachusetts in 1857, he secured the honor of two re-elections. At the outbreak of the late civil strife, President Lincoln sent him a commission as Major-General of Volunteers, and from that time, until he was relieved from command after the evacuation of Alexandria by the Federal forces in 1864, he participated in the struggle with sturdy zeal and varying success, proving himself a confident rather than a bold or a capable commander. He entered Congress again in the same year, continued a member of the House of Representatives for two succeeding terms, and occupied the important and responsible position of Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the Fortieth Congress. Although his political prestige has been reduced by his military record, and, in the light of the calmer judgment of peaceful times, he is considered a man of only mediocre abilities, yet his popularity as a campaign speaker contributed largely to his latest candidacy, and he is again a member of the House of Representatives.

In the biographical dictionaries, General Banks is classified as a "statesman." There be, indeed, in these latter days, statesmen and statesmen; but whatever qualifications are required for rank in this very high category, whether the individual so ranked be prudent, learned, patriotic, far-seeing, and scrupulous; or, whether he be

only a politician, owing his notoriety or success to accident and a certain small cleverness, it will certainly be admitted that he should be held to a fair and reasonable account for his public declarations.

During the winter of 1875–6, General Banks delivered upon the lecture platform a discourse entitled "The Republic; will it endure?" He thought it just and becoming to include therein a very curious, and, as it will be made to appear, a wholly unaccountable attack upon the Catholic Church.

The specific portion of General Banks's lecture which we propose to consider is included in his allegations concerning democracy, divine right, and hereditary sovereignty. General Banks, discussing these topics, said, in substance, as reported:[1]

1. That the elective principle existed in all ages of the world, and that democratic government had its inception from the very creation.

2. That the idea of the rule of kings by divine right and hereditary sovereignty was invented by a Pope for selfish political purposes, and first applied in the case of Pepin.[2]

Is it reasonable to doubt that General Banks has read the Old Testament? How, then, shall we account for his assertion that "democratic government had its inception from the very creation?" It existed in the mind of God; but General Banks's assertion has to do with political organization only. How shall we justify him in declaring that the divine right of kings was an invention of a Pope? How shall we account for his extraordinary discovery that the principle of hereditary sovereignty was unknown until the head of the Christian Church formulated it for selfish purposes in the coronation of Pepin in the eighth century?

The first political principle in the Old Testament is rule by divine right, and the second is hereditary sovereignty.

As early as chapter xiii. of Genesis we find divine right and hereditary sovereignty proclaimed by God himself to Abraham. Abraham is commanded to leave his own country and kindred, and depart into a land which God should show to him, and when he reached Canaan, "the Lord appeared unto Abraham and said, 'Unto thy seed will I give this land.'" In chapter xiii. we read again, "And the Lord said unto Abraham," after Lot was separated from him, "Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever."

Will General Banks inform us what meaning he places upon these

[1] Chicago Tribune, November 16, 1875.

[2] This portion of the discourse was not reported *verbatim*, and is taken from the concurrent memory and understanding of auditors, of whom the writer was one.

words of the Lord to Abraham, if their meaning be not rule by divine right and hereditary sovereignty?

God repeats his promise in chapter xvii: 8, and in the same chapter we find an explicit declaration of a like character concerning Ishmael (v. 20): "And as for Ishmael, I have heard thee: Behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful and will multiply him exceedingly; twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation."

Can General Banks discover any import in this except monarchy by divine right and hereditary royalty?

The Lord confers upon Jacob the divine right through the mouth of Isaac, whose heir he is: "Let the people serve thee, and nations bow down to thee: be lord over thy brethren, and let thy mother's sons bow down before thee; cursed be every one that curseth thee, and blessed be he that blesseth thee."

Could there be a more lucid and positive affirmation than this of rule by divine right, and of the fact, as well as the principle of hereditary sovereignty?

Nor was the rule thus established by God Himself, "from the very creation," a democratic one. God appeared unto Jacob (Gen. xxxv.) and "said unto him: I am God Almighty—be fruitful and multiply; a nation and a company of nations shall be of thee, and kings shall come out of thy loins. And the land which I gave Abraham and Isaac, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed after thee will I give the land." Jacob understood this assurance in its simple and obvious purpose, and, on his death-bed, he names his heir, proclaims him to the brethren, and prophesies that the sceptre shall not pass away from him. The land of inheritance is formulated by God in Numbers xxvii., and again in xxxiv. Here the Lord directs Moses, saying: "These are the names of the men who shall divide the land unto you—Eleazer, the priest, and Joshua, the son of Nun. And ye shall take one prince of every tribe, to divide the land by inheritance." The Israelites understood the law of hereditary sovereignty as being divinely ordained for their government; they say unto Gideon (Judges viii.): "Rule thou over us, both thou and thy son, and thy son's son also." General Banks will search the history of the Jews in vain for any trace of democratic government, as he intended the term to be understood, or for any application of the elective principle, either in the heads of tribes, "the princes of the people," in the national leaders, or in the selection of kings. Divine right and hereditary sovereignty mark every page of the history of the people of God. He chose the founders of the tribes; He authorized the great dictators of the Jewish nation to name their own successors if He failed to nominate them; and although the kingship was not assigned as the property of any branch in any

tribe, the king was invariably named by God, anointed by some one appointed by Him for that purpose, and the throne passed from son to son so long as the natural heirs were worthy to wear the crown. Thus Moses selected Joshua, and the Lord approved of the action, and gave His commands unto him. On the death of Joshua, the people did not assemble *en masse*, or by representatives, and elect his successor; they knew that they were to be governed by divine right, and "they asked the Lord, saying, Who shall go up for us against the Canaanites?" (Judges i: 1), "and the Lord said, Judah shall go up." When the people desired a king they did not propose to elect one, as they would naturally have done, had they been accustomed to the democratic idea, as General Banks would have us believe. God acceded to their desire, and said, "Thou shalt set him king over thee whom the Lord thy God shall choose" (Deut. xvii.). It is true that Abimelech was not chosen by God, but neither was he by the people. He reached the throne of the Shechemites by a bloody usurpation and revolution, having murdered his brethren. But the sole claim which he made was that of hereditary sovereignty: "My father fought for you, and adventured his life for, and delivered you out of the land of Midian." Because he was a revolutionist and a usurper, "God sent an evil spirit between Abimelech and the men of Shechem," and in the conflict which followed, he lost his life. We see the principles of hereditary sovereignty and divine right even among the prophets; for, when Samuel became old, he appointed his two sons to govern Israel in his name; and when the people became dissatisfied with their administration, they did not organize a convention or foment a conspiracy, but prayed Samuel, as the chosen representative of God, to give them a king. (1. Samuel, viii.) According to divine direction, the aged prophet described the monarch whom the Lord would appoint, and made known to the Jews the despotic qualities which would characterize royal supremacy; but they persisted in their prayer, and Samuel, under the inspiration of God, anointed Saul and proclaimed him king. The people had no voice in the selection; Saul had no title whatever to the throne, except that of authorized selection by God, and his rule was, therefore, exclusively by divine right. Indeed, the people were greatly astonished at the choice, and cried out, in their amazement: "Is Saul also among the prophets?" Samuel answered: "Behold, the Lord hath set a king over you!" (1. Samuel, xii.) The royal authority was also intended to be hereditary in Saul's line, and would have so remained had not that monarch offended God by assuming sacerdotal functions. For this offence he was pronounced "unworthy to be the founder of a race of kings;" and Samuel, commanded by God, anointed David as his successor. So accustomed were the Jews to the idea of heirship, that, on the death of Saul, the North-

ern tribes supported the claims of his son Ishbosheth, and David's title was recognized only by the tribe of Judah. A long war ensued, terminating in the murder of the Pretender by his own guards, and the universal recognition of the divine right of David and his heirs to be kings of Israel. David was succeeded by his son Solomon; Solomon was succeeded by his son Rehoboam. The ten Northern tribes revolted, according to divine orders, and accepted as their king Jeroboam, whom the Lord had chosen by the mouth of the Prophet Abijah; but it was a part of the Divine purpose to keep the crown in the line of David, and after many cruel experiences, through all of which we find the principle of hereditary sovereignty scrupulously observed, the revolting tribes were carried off into captivity. Rehoboam continued to rule over Judah, and was succeeded by his son, and the crown descended in legitimate succession in the house of David for five hundred years, and expired only with the destruction of Jerusalem, and the captivity into Babylon. At no period in the history of the Jewish nation, whether the head of the state were a tribal chief, a priest, a prophet, or a king, do we find any trace of democracy. Their political institutions inclosed two principles,—divine right and hereditary sovereignty; the two principles which General Banks declares to have been invented by a Pope in the eighth century of the Christian era, or nearly three thousand years after they were in indisputable force among the chosen people of God.

General Banks will be equally unsuccessful in maintaining the existence of the democratic idea among the nations with whom the Jews had social or commercial relations. There "were kings that reigned in the land of Edom" before any king reigned over the children of Israel. (1. Chronicles i.) Kings governed Egypt when Abraham visited that country, and more than a century before Lower Egypt had been subdued by a roving people from the Mediterranean, who were also governed by kings. Indeed, we read of kings on almost every page of history contemporaneous with the Jewish, and the number of monarchs must have been exceedingly great in proportion to their domain. In one of the early chapters of Genesis we read of the battle of the four kings against the five. It was under one of the Pharaohs that Joseph acted as regent, and the immediate descendants of Noah were formed into a monarchy in which the Assyrian Empire was founded. When Joshua reduced the city of Ai he hung the king thereof (Joshua viii.); and afterwards contended against "kings which were on this side Jordan, in the hills, and in the valleys, and in all the coasts of the great sea over against Lebanon, the Hittite, and the Amorite, the Canaanite, the Perizzite, the Hivite, and the Jebusite" (Joshua ix.), who formed an offensive league against him. He rescued Gideon from an assault by five

other kings, whom he slew. There were kings of Hazor, of Madon, of Shimron, of Achsaph; there were kings "on the north of the mountains," and kings "on the plains south of Cinneroth," and kings "in the valley," and kings "in the borders of Dan in the west." Joshua slew them all, destroyed their armed followers, and took all the land; and went on his victorious way only to find and destroy still more kings. He smote thirty and one kings "on the other side Jordan toward the rising sun," and when Joshua had become old and stricken in years, he divided his dominions among the natural heirs (Joshua xxv.).

General Banks need not fear the accuracy of our citations. So exact a historian as he would be liable to discard any version of the Scriptures except that which he had been pleased to adopt as his own. We have scrupulously, therefore, made every reference to the King James Bible, out of compliment to the correctness of General Banks as a chronicler of fact, to his impartiality as a commentator, and his fairness and courtesy as a public speaker.

General Banks may insist, however, that the Jews, being under the direct government of God, are not to be offered as witnesses against his proposition that the elective principle had been sanctioned in all ages, and that democracy "had its inception from the very creation." He may direct us to other nations than the Jews for proof of his assertion; and, to accommodate him, we will waive, in starting on the quest, that portion of his bewildering remarks in which he positively declares that the "elective principle had received the *Divine* and human sanction." The hero of so many brilliant and successful retreats will find no difficulty in admitting that he must give up this point also; for the Divine sanction, it will not be pretended, was ever given to any ancient polity, except to that of the Jews.

We shall seek with General Banks the evidence of his theory among nations who did not enjoy the immediate control of Providence. Shall we turn to Assyria? It is the oldest state of which either legend or archæologist affords us curious and reliable information. The Babylonians have a cosmogony of their own, corroborating, in many respects, the Mosaic account of the creation; and the first political feature discernible is a dynasty of native kings who reigned 34,080 years. This, of course, is fabulous; but not even in prehistoric fables can we detect a suggestion of General Banks's elective principle which had its inception "from the very creation!" Niebuhr[1] says, "This is evidently a fable; for while the kings at first reign upwards of two thousand years, the reigns of the subsequent ones become

[1] Lectures on Ancient History. By B. G. Niebuhr. In 3 vols. London. Vol. 1, p. 18.

shorter and shorter, until, in the end, they have the duration of an ordinary human life. This dynasty, therefore, being quite fabulous, must be put aside; we must look upon it as analogous to the empire of Nimrod in Genesis. But it may be asserted that where it ends, at least two thousand years before Alexander, the real history of Babylonia commences." But the first fact of the authentic history is the existence of kings. Berosus, a Babylonian priest who lived sixty-two years after the taking of Babylon by Alexander, wrote a treatise on the antiquities of his nation, based, as he claims, upon ancient documents; and he found no trace of an elective principle or of a democracy; for, according to his sources of information, Babylon was ruled by a king, Zoroaster, immediately after the deluge, and the crown was hereditary. Niebuhr does not wholly decline the authority of Berosus; he virtually admits that the dynasty of Zoroaster included eight kings; that it was succeeded by another dynasty including eleven kings, and this in turn by another and another, the duration of each being determined by extinction, revolutions, or invasion. The authentic history of Babylon and Assyria contains no form of government except the monarchial, and the sceptre was always hereditary, no matter how won, or by whom won.[1] It is true that the Medes threw off the rule of the Assyrians, and, for a period, lived without kings. But it is equally true, on the authority of Herodotus, that this period was one of anarchy, each tribe of the Median people governing itself as best it could, under a tribal head, until a chief arose strong enough to reunite the scattered factions.[2] It appears to be equally true in all ancient history, that, when kings did not rule, anarchy did. No democracy arose in the early years of the world upon the ruins of an empire; the elective principle never tossed a crown off a despot's head, nor set up a senate to express the popular will.

Unhappily, too, for General Banks, the Assyrian rule, in addition to being hereditary, was exercised by divine right; for the Assyrians had their Divinity, such as it was, and rendered unto it abject and awful homage. Assur, the god of gods, was also king and father of kings; the ruling monarch reigned under divine protection, and offences against the throne were, therefore, offences against the deity. The king was high priest of Assur, and his commands, whether in religion or politics, were absolute.

New light has recently been thrown upon ancient history in the East, by the deciphering of monumental inscriptions, as well as by the large increase in the number of well-preserved antiques, whose

[1] Analogous cases are often met with in the East, as that of the Seleucid Demetrius, under whose name money continued to be coined after his death, it being intended to preserve his kingdom for his son. (Niebuhr, vol. 1, p. 30, note 2.)

[2] Niebuhr, vol. 1, p. 36, note 6.

recovery supplies omissions and corrects misapprehensions concerning events which shaped the destinies not only of the Eastern nations, but of the world; but this new hieroglyphic and monumental testimony is all damaging to the roseate theory of General Banks. It supplies historians with a complete list of Assyrian kings, whose hereditary sovereignty was disturbed only by conquest or revolution from 1850 B. C. downward.[1] It demonstrates also that monarchy was the universal régime among contemporaneous nations; and that every tribe numerous enough to fight and strong enough to rob, and nearly every city capable of defence, was ruled by a chief whose power was absolute, and whose office was hereditary. Some of the finest of the Assyrian sculptures in the British Museum were found in the palace and temples which a victorious Assyrian conqueror erected about 860 B. C., the one to perpetuate his own glory, the others to honor the gods who had protected his royal person. Shalmanezer, son and successor of this monarch, won some of his greatest triumphs east of the Euphrates, and he invariably won them from kings. Macaulay says that "historians rarely descend to those details from which alone the real state of a community can be collected. Hence posterity is too often deceived by the vague hyperboles of poets and rhetoricians who mistake the splendor of a court for the happiness of a people." But all the trustworthy evidence which has come down to us of the Eastern nations relates almost exclusively to courts, kings, and wars; the people existed as subjects, soldiers, or slaves. The kings constantly crowd the foreground, the people, like the Greek chorus, appear to perform whatever part the exigencies of the royal military hero or the wishes of the despicable tyrant require. "History," as left upon the monuments, "is neither more nor less than biography on a large scale," as Lamartine said, but it is always the biography of despots, not of democrats. Rawlinson[2] thus epitomizes the political institutions of all the early Asiatic nations: "The form of government is, in every case, a monarchy; the monarchy is always hereditary; and the hereditary monarch is a despot." Unlike General Banks, this patient and unerudite historian was unable to discover either democracy or the elective principle, in any land, among any nation; "despotism," he says, "is the simplest, coarsest, rudest, of all forms of civil government. It was thus naturally the first which men, pressed by their need, extemporized." In Egypt, whose dynasties are traced back 3000

[1] Ancient History, from the Monuments. Assyria. By George Smith, of the Department of Oriental Antiquities, British Museum.

[2] Ancient History, from the earliest times to the Fall of the Roman Empire. By George Rawlinson, M.A., Camden, Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford.

B.C., the joint ideas of divine right and hereditary sovereignty were so intimately allied that the first dynasty of kings coalesced with the last dynasty of gods.[1] The sun was the great God; "the king was a kind of sun on earth, and was believed to be descended from the gods." The government of Egypt "began with the native gods; they were succeeded by a dynasty of demigods, and these again by one of deceased kings, who likewise were not human beings."[2] So devoid were the Egyptians of the perception of an elective principle having the Divine and human sanction from the very creation, that, to complete the record of their royal houses, "they had recourse to the fabrication of a series of dynasties,"[3] uniting men with gods, the rule being always by divine right and the sovereignty hereditary. Does General Banks presume that the obelisks and pyramids support his proposition? The obelisks belong to the eighteenth dynasty of Egyptian kings, and the pyramids to the dynasty of Memphis, more than 2000 years before Christ. There was no democratic rule in Egypt prior to the building of these wonderful works; and the history of the country is too well authenticated from those times downward to admit of any debate regarding an elective principle. The political history of Egypt is repeated throughout Africa; kings ruled by what their base cultus reckoned a divine right, and dynasties were changed only by revolutions.

Shall we look into Persia? We shall find no elective principle there. The earliest form of government was tribal, which crystallized, by natural process, into a monarchy,[4] and the tribal chieftainship, like the later crown, was despotic and hereditary. The relation between the gods of Persia and the king was extremely intimate, and the occupant of the throne was deemed the highest and most sacred representative of the deity. The Persians were religious fanatics in politics and in war, and, wherever they carried their victorious arms, they burnt and destroyed the temples of their nature-worshipping enemies.[5] Throughout Asia, wherever the domination of the Persian throne in the time of Cyrus was not acknowledged, there were no political institutions of any fixed form. Nomadic bands wandered hither and thither, to-day conquering, to-morrow conquered. Dynasties kept the Persian throne with a relatively secure tenure, and they were sometimes changed by such military tactics as resulted in the elevation of Darius. The

---

[1] Ancient History, from the Monuments. Egypt from the Earliest Times to B.C. 300. By S. Birch, LL.D.

[2] Niebuhr.

[3] Niebuhr.

[4] Persia, from the Earliest Period to the Arab Conquest. By W. S. W. Vaux, A.M., F.R.S.

[5] Ibid.

chief general of the army murdered the king, and his son, according to the established rule, mounted the throne. The murderer, finding the young monarch too self-asserting, put him and all his children to the sword, and awarded the sceptre to his personal friend Darius. Although Alexander overthrew the Persian empire when he defeated Darius at Arbela, even that conqueror respected the principle of hereditary sovereignty, by which he held his own throne, and the native line of Persian rulers continued to exercise a nominal dominion over the province of Persis, as dependents on the Greek empire. The oldest monumental inscriptions at Persepolis are over the figure of a king; and another inscription, also referring to the king, indicates the personal protection which his majesty was believed to receive from the gods.

Nowhere, of late years, has the antiquarian and archæologist been more successful than in India, whose traditions, scriptures, and legends have been made familiar to modern ears and eyes through many trustworthy media; and we are now in possession of "the very words of the men who wandered by the banks of Indus three thousand years ago; and possessing those words we are truly nearer to them as intelligent beings than we can even hope to be to Egyptian or Ninevite.[1] The Rig-Veda hymns date back twelve centuries before the Christian era, and these, unhappily for General Banks, give no hint of an elective principle, but describe and glorify kings. One of the ancient lays declares that "the king, before whom there walks a priest, lives well-established in his own house; to him the earth yields forever, and before him the people bow of their own accord. Unopposed he conquers treasures. The gods protect him." The divine rewards were plentifully lavished on the king, who gave his Brahmin priests thousands of girls and tens of thousands of elephants. Kings were more or less identified with the gods, and the royal authority was a rigid application of rule by divine right. The "Ramayana," the Odyssey of India, is the story of a hero, now worshipped in India as a god, who was the son of a king; and the native Homer, knowing nothing of General Banks's theory of a democracy sanctioned by God and man from the very creation, and being familiar with only a single political form, to wit, the monarchial, represents even the monkeys as governed by a king, with whom Rama enters into a compact for the invasion of Ceylon.

Rule by divine right was quite as clearly established as hereditary sovereignty among all the nations that achieved renown prior to the development of political power in Greece. Philology alone

[1] Ancient and Mediæval India. By Frances Power Cobbe, Frazer's Magazine, 1870. A review of Mrs. Manning's work on the same subject. 2 vols. London.

advances convincing proof of this, and General Banks will not except to the dictum of Prof. Max Müller, although we fear that his reluctance to do so cannot be based upon an acquaintance with the writings of that pertinacious scholar. Müller says: "If I ventured to characterize the worship of all the Semitic nations by one word, I should say it was pre-eminently a worship of *God in history*, of God as affecting the destinies of individuals and races and nations, rather than of God as wielding the powers of nature." In other words, the Semitic nations saw God in their governments, which regulated their destinies; and to this stupid superstition despots were often indebted, as much as to their guards and armies, for the prolongation of their intolerable and hideous conduct. Of the people who lived in Italy a thousand years before Charlemagne, Müller says: "We could easily prove by their language that they had kings;" the name for king is the same in Sanskrit, Latin, Teutonic, and Celtic; and "we know again that kingly government was established and recognized by the Aryans at the same prehistoric period."

In many of the oldest tongues the same word means king and God!

General Banks may not care to dispute that in China the earliest and the unbroken form of government is hereditary monarchy by divine right; he may not, however, be equally amiable in surrendering prehistoric England. It becomes necessary to assure him that the architecture and sculpture of that country prove that kings were the original rulers, and that the *cromlechs*, of whose history and character so much was written a few years ago, are royal tombs, whose occupants governed the island in advance of Roman invasion or contemporaneous knowledge, the date of the commencement of whose reigns is entirely unknown.[1]

We have said nothing of Greece,—Greece of the poets and the mythologists, or Greece of history. We might be excused for omitting it from the discussion altogether, because General Banks was ingenuous enough to admit that the Greek republics, on account of the prevalence and legality of slavery, were republics only in name; and he did not urge them in proof of his assertion that the democratic principle had existed "from the very creation." We do not propose, however, to take advantage of General Banks in any respect; we decline to accept the concession which might thus be claimed with entire propriety, and our omission of Greece up to this point

[1] The Druidical Temples at Asbury. By the Rev. John Lockhart Ross. It is strange that General Banks and Rev. Mr. Ross should not be better acquainted; they have a bond of friendship in their common anti-Catholic prejudices. The fault, we fear, lies with General Banks; for, on second thought, we remember that he is on no more familiar terms with other historians.

in the discussion, has been with the specific design of putting not only Greece of the legends, Greece of the kings, Greece of the aristocrats and the oligarchies, but even the Greek republics in evidence against General Banks's proposition concerning Divine right and hereditary sovereignty.

The first objective characteristic of Greek mythology is the existence of kings; the second is their Divine right; and the third is hereditary sovereignty.

In the authentic history of Greece, popularly so-called, the first fact discovered is the existence of kings; the second is hereditary sovereignty; and the association of royal prerogatives with the attributes, functions, and protection of the gods, was so universal and complete, that it was equivalent to rule by Divine right.

The Greek republics were such, it is true, only in name; but in whatever quality and quantity of democracy we are to accredit to them, we shall discover not only the absence of the pure democratic principles—as General Banks and we alike understand it—but we shall establish the existence of the principle of hereditary sovereignty; and the records of the republics themselves shall prove that kingly government by descent was the only ancient polity with which the Greeks were acquainted.

General Banks argued that the existence of slavery in these republics practically nullified their claim to respect as popular democracies. He would not hesitate to admit, we presume, that slavery and pure democracy are inconsistent in principle, and incompatible in fact. For this we thank him; and it will be extremely interesting, a few moments later, to carry the admission to its logical end, waiving, in advance, any right to his thanks in return, being fully convinced that we shall receive none.

Taking, in a collective sum, the fables, legends, mythology, and poetry of that nation, we have prehistoric Greece; and the literature, thus classified, bears us back to the farthest limits of Hellenic guess, tradition, or knowledge. Whatever form of human government the Greeks conceived to be the oldest, we shall find within this literature; mythology and the poets lead us unerringly, if the historians cannot, to what Greece supposed to be "the very creation." What form of government is thus revealed? The democratic? Never. Can we find here any trace, even a faint one, of General Banks's elective principle? None.

The most fantastic mythology discloses Uranus, the oldest of the gods, king of heaven and earth. His sons, the Titans, assailed and dethroned him; and Saturn, the boldest of the conspirators, was permitted to mount the regal chair on condition that he should destroy his male children, in order that the crown should not descend in his line. Here we have a king, rule by Divine right, and

hereditary sovereignty on the very threshold of Ionian culture. Jupiter, the great god of the Greek and the Roman, obtained his immortal supremacy by this principle of hereditary sovereignty thus proclaimed from "the very creation;" for Rhea, the wife of Saturn, concealed the birth of Jupiter, Neptune, and Pluto; and, after a bitter strife, Jupiter wrested the sceptre of the world from both his father and his assailants, and divided the universal dominion between his two brothers and himself, keeping heaven as his own domain, assigning the sea to Neptune, and awarding hades to Pluto.

The fabulous lore of Greece, so abundant in detail, so rich in imagery, so extensive in range both of imagination and tradition, only confirms the deduction afforded by this brief résumé of the essence of mythology. The poets, tragic, comic, or epic; the dramatists, the philosophers of Greece, the classic orators, the lawyers, the demagogues, and the men who by street harangues, aroused the martial passions, or inflamed the malicious and selfish caprices of the populace—none of these, so far as we can judge by the residue of their writings or utterances, had any belief in the existence of a pure elective principle, or any suspicion that such a form of polity was known to, or prevailed among, their ancestors. The Greece that preceded the republics in history, in story, and in song, was a royal Greece. The republics were but aristocracies, in which the most forcible, the effective, and the favorite popular ideas were those associated with royal glory and hereditary power.

Thus the Greek chorus cries in Sophocles' *Electra*, after hearing of the disaster in the chariot race which resulted in the supposed death of Orestes:

"Alas! the race of my old sovereigns hath perished, it doth seem, e'en to the roots."

Again Electra cries:

"O King Apollo, hear propitiously
Their prayer," etc.

We can scarcely open a page of Homer without finding allusions to kings, rule by Divine right, and hereditary sovereignty. Nor is our reading exceptional; yet, lest so precise a scholar as General Banks should demur to Catholic construction of the classics, we will offer him a commentator no less distinguished among statesmen, no less popular among the enemies of the Catholic Church, than the ex-Premier of England, Mr. W. E. Gladstone, who has made Homer a study in such hours as he could spare from politics and polemics, and who has given to the booksellers if not to posterity, more than one volume on the works and the personality of

the father of poetry, from which lovers of classic verse are able to derive new recreation. Is it possible that a recondite savant like General Banks, who essays to lecture on the forms of government which have existed "from the very creation," has not read *Juventus Mundi?* It is evident that he has not. Homer, moreover, was something more than a poet; he was a historian. But he was still more; he painted whenever he could, with the brush of a Claude Lorraine, and no page of what he offers as Greek history, fails to make his beloved nation, its heroes, its institutions, or its laws, as much more admirable than they were in fact, as his Greek pride and prejudices, and the marvellous genius of his pencil, could inspire. He systematically belittles and degrades everything and everybody inimical to Greek interest or Grecian glory, while he exalts, at the same time, his own country and countrymen to the skies that enveloped Mount Olympus. And yet Homer never suspected that his nation possessed so beautiful and ennobling a gift as the elective principle! The rule of the kings by Divine right appears to have been clearly believed by him, and is no less explicitly understood by Mr. Gladstone:[1]

"The King, as such, stands in a special relation to deity. The epithet Theios, Divine, is only applied to such among the living as have this relation. The king is also Diotrephes, or reared by Zeus and Diogenes, or born of Zeus; and these titles are given rarely below the kingly order even to a prince or ruler, or of inferior degree or eminence. *It is expressly declared that kings derive the right to rule from Zeus, from whom descended, by successive deliveries, the sceptre of Agamemnon.*"

Here General Banks must surely see kings rule by Divine right, and hereditary sovereignty in a single sentence. Yet he cannot doubt, that if history were capable of developing so startling a fact, as that rule by Divine right and hereditary sovereignty were coined by a Pope for the furtherance of papal pretensions, Mr. Gladstone would have run upon the fact during some of his incursions for antiquated polemical weapons to be refurbished against the Vatican, while General Banks was zealously engaged in planning some of his retreats. Again, speaking of Agamemnon and the great chiefs, Mr. Gladstone says:[2]

"The office which these persons bore was hereditary in the line of the eldest son."

And once more:[3]

"The case of Telemachus supplies us with an express declaration of the title of the son to succeed his father."

The principle of hereditary sovereignty seems to have been

[1] Juventus Mundi, p. 417. [2] Ib., p. 422. [3] Ib., p. 423.

universal and unqualified, and its application to have been disturbed only by usurpation or revolution.[1]

"We have other means of connecting the name of Iasos with western Peloponnesus.[2] For Amphion, the King of the Minneian Orchomenus, was the son of Iasos. He was also the father of Chloris, whom Neleus married, and who became Queen of Pulos. . . . Further, Homer acquaints us that he (Amphion) and his brother Zethos, first founded and fortified Thebes; for, says the poet, not even they could hold it unfortified. As his daughter married Neleus, this fortification must have been effected four to five generations before the Iroica. But he founded no dynasty in Thebes. On the contrary, we find from Homer that Œdipus ruled there, apparently in succession to his father, two generations before the war. And, according to tradition, he was the descendant of Kadmos, who had colonized Thebes from Phœnicia."

Not to carry to the verge of minimism, these evidences of kings, Divine right, and hereditary sovereignty, General Banks can satisfy himself by reading the Iliad or Odyssey, if his leisure permits, and Mr. Gladstone's commentaries will supply him with a safe and convenient guide. He will not fail to observe that the ex-premier almost mourns that Homer could not give to heroic Greece a tinge of even constitutional democracy, such as would be consistent with an Englishman's ideas of political prudence. "There is no decision by numbers," he says,[3] "*the doctrine of majorities is an invention, an expedient of a more advanced social development.*"

Mr. Gladstone has been unable to trace the democratic idea or elective principle back to "the very creation;" and yet Mr. Gladstone is accounted a man of exact and general information, albeit in matters relating to the dead past, whereas General Banks has never been accused, so far as we are aware, of scholarship of any kind whatever; scholarship—"Pity 'tis, 'tis true,"—not being a necessary qualification for a statesman in our country and our time.

When we enter upon the authentic history of Greece, the portal we cross is that of a royal palace, and our first salutation is made, on bended knee, before the footstool of a king whose sceptre is hereditary, and whose diadem boasts the touch of Divine right. "The kings," says Niebuhr, "descended from the gods, rule as instituted by the gods." This skeptical historian, always slow to accept as fact anything savoring of the mythical, says: "All the tribes of Greece anciently had kings belonging to some heroic family." In a word, the principle of hereditary sovereignty obtained so fixedly among the Greeks, that in their myths, as in their acts, they feel compelled to annihilate a reigning dynasty, in order to place a fresh hero on the throne. Niebuhr notes this:[4]

---

[1] Juventus Mundi, p. 48, *et seq.*

[2] Mr. Gladstone follows a nomenclature of his own in Juventus Mundi, which he explains in his preface.

[3] P. 434.

[4] Vol. I, p. 212 *et seq.*

"I have already noticed the peculiar manner in which the heroic age, and especially its kingly families, are made to disappear and perish. . . . All these stories evidently have no other meaning than to explain how the Greek people of the mythical age and the race of heroes vanish from history."

It would be a mere waste of space to dwell upon the administration of the kings of Greece, about whose epochs and achievements there is no dispute. They ruled by Divine right; their prerogatives passed to their sons, and the succession was not taken away, except by social or military violence, when it had not been extinguished in death.

An examination of the laws and conduct of the Greek Republics confirms General Banks's admission that they were democratic only in name. The number of free citizens was exceedingly small in proportion to the whole population,—and the freedom of this small number was political, rather than civil. The free citizen of Athens was not subject to any power outside his own state; but he had very little liberty within it. He was as much a slave to the state as his own bondsman was to him. Corinth, Athens, and Sparta[1] were politically free; but their people were civilly enslaved. The idea of personal liberty, such as it exists among us, was quite unknown in the most glorious days of these *quasi* democracies, and even idealists, like Socrates and Plato, did not understand it, nor think it the proper aim of their country.[2] As for Aristotle, he repudiated democracy with unconstrained candor, and proclaimed his belief in an aristocracy.

The Greek Republics were aristocracies. It is absurd to affirm that they were anything else. The few ruled the many. They were what we may justly call aristocratic despotisms. The minority held the mass of the people in an abject subjection for which we have no modern parallel, except Russia and the German Empire. Slavery, in a most horrible form, was maintained by law; church and state were united; freedom of speech was not tolerated, and the wisest and purest sometimes suffered, like Socrates, for differing in opinion from the faction which happened to be dominant; and when all regular or judicial methods of tyranny failed in accomplishing the desired limit of interference and oppression, that ingenious device of spite and malice—ostracism—was flung into the hands of demagogues for the worry and persecution of the innocent. The *demos* of Greece never has been clearly understood, or satisfactorily explained. We do not know what part, even, the free fraction of the people actually had in shaping the destinies of the republics. But

[1] Macaulay says, the Spartans were "tormented by ten thousand absurd restraints, unable to please themselves in the choice of their wives, their suppers, or their company."

[2] Vide The Republic, lib. ii., iii., iv.

it is a singular fact that through the quickly-shifting scenes of Greek democracy, we find the pro-cohesive and conservative principles to be Divine right and hereditary sovereignty. Nor is this to be wondered at, for upon these rested the foundations, historical, political, traditional, and poetical, of the nation. Lycurgus, for instance, became lawgiver under the sanction of the Delphic oracle,[1] and he was a member of the royal family of Sparta. He proved a despot of the most stubborn character, and, while he unified and strengthened Sparta, he destroyed every vestige of personal free dom. The moral standard by which the efficiency of individual conduct was measured was deception and hypocrisy.[2] In Athens, the rule of the archons was hereditary, and after it became elective within limits, the aristocracy grew bolder and more oppressive, and the *Agora*, or General Assembly of that portion of the people which was entitled to merit, ceased.

Draco was one of the nobles, and so little respect had he for the rights of the people that he made death the penalty for every crime, and reserved to the aristocrats the function of determining what constituted crime. Solon was a lineal descendant of King Codrus. Pisistratus was an heir of the kings of Athens, and after his death his sons continued to govern the republic solely by right of hereditary succession. Miltiades traced his lineage to a ruling family of Corinth. Themistocles owed his first popularity to his princely origin; Miltiades, Aristides, Pericles, were all aristocrats, and their right to command was hereditary. Cimon belonged to the most ancient nobility of Athens, and, when he was expelled after brilliant service for the republic, he was succeeded by another hereditary aristocrat, Pericles. When one-man rule passed away, mob rule ensued, and then Athens fell an easy prey to Sparta, still clinging to hereditary aristocracy; and when aristocratic rule was restored, the first act of the Thirty was to limit the franchise to three thousand of the citizens.

We do not propose to touch the history of Rome. Every lad poring over his desk knows that the Romans did not enjoy any elective principle; that their government was by kings, hereditary, and of Divine right, until invasion, excess, and decay, after producing many changes—none of which had the form of genuine democracy—finally overthrew the empire.

It is possible that General Banks will not be content with our chronology. He may place his creation as far back as the surmises of Haeckel and the ultra German scientific speculators suggest. He is certainly at liberty to do so; and if he detects in that unknown but much talked of bourne, whence no traveller has yet returned,

[1] Niebuhr, vol. i., p. 259. [2] Constitution of Lycurgus, discussed by Rawlinson.

satisfactory evidence of the elective principle, enjoying both the Divine and human sanction, the world will owe him a heavy obligation. He may make the startling discovery that democracy existed among the protozoa.

There are, however, fashions in chronology as well as in science, and we wish to give General Banks the benefit of the very latest, if it be not a highly approved style of hypothesis in dates. The beginning of the Pharaohs, for instance, has been placed as early as 2800 B.C. That is approaching very nearly to "the creation;" but then, on the other hand, it only confirms the existence of kings and not of democracy. Here is China. Industrious guesswork may be credited with establishing the historical period of the flowery kingdom as early as 2637 B.C. But unfortunately, again, it is a dynasty that we find there. There are the Indo-Europeans; Prof. Whitney is quite sure that philology demonstrates their national existence at least 3000 B.C. Did they not contrive, inherit, or maintain an elective principle at that dim and awful distance from the possibilities of precise investigation? No; they were petty tribes having hereditary chiefs. It is to be deplored, moreover, for the sake of General Banks's argument, that the speculators who recede beyond usually accepted historical limits insist that, as they recede, civilization disappears; kingdoms become tribes, and kings petty chieftains; tribes disintegrate into inchoate, quarrelling, savage elements, and finally man, instead of appearing in a magnificent transformation scene from savagery into an elective principle with the Divine and human sanction, proves to be a mere brute having nothing in common with his fellows except ferocious and deadly instincts.

We have now explored antiquity to "the very creation," for the elective principle which this distinguished soldier and statesman promised us we should find there. That promise history has been found unable to fulfil. He assured us also that the rule of kings by Divine right and hereditary sovereignty, was a comparatively modern invention of the eighth century of the Christian era. On the contrary, we have found kings, Divine right, and hereditary sovereignty in every age and among every nation of antiquity; and if any political institutions existed "from the creation," it has been made manifest that these political institutions included kings, Divine right, and hereditary sovereignty.

We approach the assertion of General Banks in regard to the Pope and King Pepin with sincere mortification, and we shall not inflict upon the unfortunate author of such a statement, an unnecessary word of reproof, much less an expression of reproach or derision. The facts whose publication General Banks's deliverance compels, is too convincing a demonstration of the quality of mind

possessed by that gentleman, and too pitiless a commentary upon the sense of responsibility cultivated by a representative public man, to admit of additional odium at the hands of a Review to which the American name and honor are exceedingly dear.

General Banks stated, in substance, that the Pope, by making Pepin King of the Franks, established the principles of the rule of kings by Divine right and hereditary sovereignty, these principles not having been previously in existence, and that the Pope did so in order to further his own selfish interests as represented in the temporal power.

We shall quote only Protestant historians upon the action so characterized.

Parke Godwin, in his *History of France*, vol. i., p. 392, covers this event thoroughly. "Was it not time," he says, professing to speak for Pepin, whom by the way, he calls "Pippin," "to bring the protracted comedy of the Merovingian dynasty to an end? For more than sixty years, his family, fertile in great men, had by their valor defended, and by their wisdom governed, the Frankish nation. During that long interval they had been at the head of its armies, maintaining the integrity and unity of its possessions, repulsing invasions, subduing revolts, and forming alliances, and receiving oaths from friendly or conquered princes. . . . No doubt the old Merovingians had been the vital men of their day, but now their descendants were merely the dead images of that vitality. . . . . Before entering upon so important a step, his prudence, if not his religion, suggested the propriety of advising in regard to it with the acknowledged head of Christendom. Accordingly he dispatched an embassy composed of Burchard, Bishop of Würtzburg, and Fulrad, Abbot of Saint Denis, his own chaplain, to the See of St. Peter with the significant question, 'whether it were better that one who wielded no authority in the land, should retain the name of king, or that it should be transferred to him who really exercised the royal power.' Zacharias the Pope was, no doubt, prepared for the question and the answer. He replied that he should be called king who had the proper wisdom and power for the office, and not *he* who was king only in name; anticipating in this the famous saying of Napoleon, '*Les carrières aux talents*' (the tools to him who can handle them). It was a sensible, *even a democratic response*, answering farther than was needful," etc.

This is the statement of Gibbon in the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*:[1]

"The Franks were perplexed between the name and substance of their government. All the powers of royalty were exercised by Pepin, mayor of the palace, and nothing

[1] 6 vols., vol. v., p. 28. Phila. ed.

except the regal title was wanting to his ambition. His enemies were crushed by his valor; his friends were multiplied by his liberality; his father had been the saviour of Christendom, and the claims of personal merit were repeated and ennobled in a descent of four generations. The name and image of royalty were still preserved in the last descendant of Clovis, the feeble Childeric; but his obsolete right could only be used as an instrument of sedition. The nation was desirous of restoring the simplicity of the constitution, and Pepin, a subject and a prince, was ambitious to ascertain his own rank and the fortune of his family. The mayor and the nobles were bound, by an oath of fidelity, to the royal phantom. The blood of Clovis was pure and sacred in their eyes, and their common ambassadors addressed the Roman pontiff to dispel their scruples, or to absolve their promise. The interest of Pope Zachary prompted him to decide, and to decide in their favor. *He pronounced that the nation might lawfully unite in the same person the office and authority of king.*"

Could there be a more explicit statement of the true basis of democracy?

Gibbon continues: . . . . "The Merovingian race disappeared from the earth, and Pepin was exalted on a buckler *by the suffrage of a free people accustomed to obey his laws, and to march under his standard.*"

The mayoralty of the palace was an elective office. The right of Childeric to the throne was merely dynastic, and Clovis, the founder of the dynasty, acquired his right, partly by concession of the Roman Emperor, who had no right in particular, and partly by conquest. The question, therefore, is between a hereditary sovereign, who is also an imbecile, and a great leader elected to his post, and acceptable to the entire nation.

Hallam[1] gives this version:

"The Mayor Pepin, surnamed Le Bref, to distinguish him from his grandfather, inheriting his father Charles Martel's talents and ambition, made in the name and with the consent of the nation, a solemn reference to the Pope Zacharias as to the deposition of Childeric III., *under whose nominal authority he himself was reigning.* The decision was favorable, that he who possessed the power should also bear the title of king. The unfortunate Merovingian was dismissed into a convent, *and the Franks, with one accord, raised Pepin to the throne,* the founder of a more illustrious dynasty."

Here we rest the case. It is due to General Banks, in the sorrowful attitude in which this unimpeachable evidence, all drawn from enemies of the Catholic Church, leaves him, to add that the action of the Pope in relation to Pepin's inquiry, has been the cause of many and very bitter wrangles between historians. It has been assailed as unwarranted interference by a spiritual prince in temporal affairs; it has been eloquently defended by Gallicans themselves. We do not choose to make or quote any defence. The historians whom we cite are all Protestants of high repute, and all inimical to the Papacy, and we prefer to let the recital stand even in their hostile phraseology. It is also true, that in the order

[1] The Middle Ages. Student's ed., p. 12.

issued by the Pope for the coronation of Pepin, the hereditary right to the crown was declared to be thereafter in his family. This was in accordance with universal and immemorial precedent, and the legitimate succession was based, not upon any novel or ingenious assumption of divine right, but upon the fact that the nation of the Franks had chosen to be ruled by a new dynasty, to whose lawful members they voluntarily bound themselves with the same fidelity which they had observed toward the preceding dynasty of the Merovingians.

This, then, is the truth:

1. The hereditary king upon the throne was an imbecile.

2. The next officer in command was the Mayor of the Palace, Pepin, who held his office by election, and had been for years the actual king.

3. He wished to become king in name as he was in fact and by faithful public service, and the people wished to make him king.

4. Pope Zachary never interfered in the situation until his opinion was solemnly asked, and his reply was the formulation of the true democratic principle that the people had a right to make him king whom they chose.[1]

5. Pepin was made king, not by the Pope's selfish and individual action, but by the joyful suffrages of a free people.

Only a word remains to be said. General Banks frankly admitted that the prevalence and legality of slavery in the Greek republics nullified their democratic claim; and we assume that, with equal candor, he will concede that slavery and theoretical democracy are ideas essentially opposed to each other.

General Banks, then, gives his argument away; for the Catholic Church first formulated democracy, when it declared the perfect equality of men before God. This equality was unknown prior to Christianity. Every nation of old, Jewish as well as Greek, held

---

[1] Historians do not hesitate to repudiate altogether the alleged connection of Pope Zachary with the coronation of Pepin. The "Universal History" (London, 1740), which has been held in high esteem, says (vol. xxii., p. 108), "There is, therefore, nothing more easy, more natural, or more probable, than the simple and short account given in the old Chronicle, that, in the annual assembly of the great men, in the month of March, it was proposed to remove Childeric and to place Pepin on the throne; which, being unanimously resolved, was, with little ceremony, performed." Regarding the version quoted by the eminent Protestant authorities cited above, the "Universal History" pronounces its substance "modern," and says, "But to the whole of this story there are some very strong objections. Such as that the ancient chronicles are equally silent as to the concurrence of the Pope, and as to this solemn coronation; that the pupil of this Saint Boniface (who, by the way, was an English monk, and, till by command of the Pope he assumed the name of Boniface, was called Wilfrid), was an entire stranger to this transaction; and that, long after the supposed sanction and coronation, Pepin's conscience was uneasy till his scruples were cured by another Pope." General Banks, however, is welcome to either horn of his dilemma.

slaves, and bought and sold them; and the practices of the most enlightened nations, in this regard, were too sickening to be dwelt upon. In Athens, at one time, there were 20,000 citizens and 40,000 slaves. Poets and philosophers looked upon slavery with complaisance. Homer considered it a proof of the wrath of Jupiter, and esteemed this victim of divine vengeance as half-witted. With Homer, a slave is but half of a man.[1] Plato indorses this curious opinion; and Aristotle explicitly affirms that nature meant one portion of men to be free, and another to be slaves, and set upon each appropriate marks of distinction—a thought which Richard Rumbold, whom Macaulay speaks of, seems to have had in his mind when he said, on the scaffold: "I never could believe that Providence had sent a few men into the world, ready booted and spurred, to ride, and millions ready saddled and bridled, to be ridden." The Catholic Church, as quickly as it was possible for her to take any action upon the subject, proceeded to enact laws embodying the words of Christ spoken by the Apostle: "There is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither bond nor free; there is neither male nor female;" and, in the records of Councils, century after century, will be found solemn and effective declarations mitigating slavery, and affirming the natural rights of the slave. The Church could not, at once, procure universal emancipation. For the slaves were Cæsar's, and she was able to render them only such assistance as her own position in society permitted. But this assistance was constant and energetic. The slave who took refuge in a church was not restored to his master until the latter had agreed to impose upon him neither corporal punishment nor additional labor. The Church defended with money and eloquence the freed slave who was in danger of reduction to servitude. Priests and monks, under the sanction of the Church, devoted themselves to slavery as a ransom for captives who were thus restored to their wives and children. Even the altar ornaments and sacred vessels were sold to purchase freedom for slaves, and it was expressly ordained that, when the Church property was thus used, neither the freedman nor his heirs should ever be required to return the whole, or any portion, of the amount expended in his behalf. The Council of Rheims, in the eighth century, excommunicated those who attempted to enslave men; and the Council of Coblentz declared that persons were guilty of homicide, who seized a Christian to sell him into slavery.[2] The whole record of the Catholic Church is consistent with the principles herein affirmed. Let General Banks point out, if he can, any contradiction in her doctrine, whereby she can be shown to waver in her devotion to the best interests of all classes of society,

[1] Inventus Mundi, p. 444. [2] This subject is discussed in extended detail by Balmes.

of the low as well as the high, of the slave as well as the free. It is not her function to prescribe forms of political government. She leaves that to the people; and when they have agreed among themselves, she requires them to respect the institutions and authority, thus legimately created, until they shall have been legitimately changed. She is the conservative force of civilization.

Her democratic spirit is further illustrated in regard to woman. With only one or two exceptions, the position of women in all nations prior to the Christian era was little better than that of the slave. The life-long victim and serf of man, she was slain by authority of law, if weak in childhood; or, permitted to mature, she was bartered, sold, or exchanged, by father or husband. The skilled woman of the Iliad is worth in the market four oxen. Aristotle, calm philosopher, and the greatest Greek of his age, writes of the inferiority of woman to man in terms closely similar to those which he applies to the inferiority of slaves. It was undoubtedly to the civil subjection of woman that St. Paul had reference when he writes to the Galatians, "there is neither bond or free; there is neither male nor female." It appears to be a prudent distribution of duties even in a democracy, that to the domestic burdens of woman political cares and excitements shall not be added; but there is nothing in the doctrine or discipline of the Catholic Church to prevent a woman from sharing the democratic suffrage, if she could legally exercise it, than there is to withhold from her the crown of a monarchy when it falls justly upon her head.

The Catholic Church recognizes and teaches the Divine right of government, but she expressly repudiates the notion that Divine right is tied down to any particular *form* of political government. There is absolutely no justification for General Banks's charge, and that reckless gentleman must have borrowed the slander from some absurd calumniator, or thrust it into his context without any clear consciousness of what he was doing. The doctrine of the Catholic Church, in regard to the source of political power, is thus stated by the greatest of her Doctors, from whom there is no dissent, St. Thomas Aquinas: "The law, strictly speaking, is directed primarily and principally to the common good; and to decree anything for the common benefit belongs either to the whole people, or to some one acting in their place." Again, "Wherefore, the choice of rulers in any state or kingdom is best when one is chosen for his merit to preside over all, and under him are other rulers chosen for their merit, and the government belongs to all, because the rulers may be chosen from any class of society, and the choice is made by all."

Bellarmine is still more direct. He is speaking of Divine right in civil power: "This power resides immediately as to its subject, in

all the multitude, for it is by Divine right. The Divine right has not given this power to any man in particular, for it has given it to the multitude."

The simple truth is that General Banks was merely "speaking to the sea." The people of Athens assembled in the Pynx, the seats of which were cut out of rock; and Themistocles turned the speaker's platform from the land to the water, because the popular fancy of Greek sovereignty was associated with the sea. Themistocles, the most consummate of demagogues, calculated, with the sagacity of instinct, that thereby he could most successfully arouse the prejudices, and inflame the passions of his audience. So General Banks "spoke to the sea." He assumed that his audiences would be chiefly non-Catholic; he surmised that the favorite vogue on the rostrum at this time is to excite the feelings of Protestants against their Roman Catholic fellow-citizens; and he expected the popular applause which usually follows so equivocal and sentimental a course. How lamentable the weakness of such conduct on the part of a public man! What a noble and manly sense of moral responsibility is thus displayed! How fine a conscience moves this representative of the dignified commonwealth of Massachusetts! Temporary success waited upon Themistocles; so pleasing fortune may coyly loiter with General Banks. But even the Greeks wearied of the demagogue; he, who had caused the ostracism of Aristides, was himself ostracized. The momentary plaudits of the thoughtless were remembered by him and them, only as a reproach in the unloved obscurity into which he sank forever.

BOOK NOTICES.

MANUAL OF UNIVERSAL CHURCH HISTORY. By *Rev. Dr. John Alzog*, Professor of Theology at the University of Freiburg. Translated, with Additions, from the ninth and last German edition, by *F. J. Pabish*, Doctor of Theology, of Canon and Civil Law, and *Rev. Thomas S. Byrne*. Vol. II. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1876.

English-speaking Catholics are under very great obligations to the translators of this work, the second volume of which has been lately issued by Clarke & Co., of Cincinnati. It supplies a want long felt in England and Ireland, as well as in the United States, by ecclesiastical students, and by intelligent lay Catholics generally. Before it appeared, we had absolutely no work, in English or Latin, sufficiently critical and comprehensive, without being at the same time too voluminous to be made a suitable text-book in our seminaries. This occasioned trouble to professors in preparing matter for their classes, which all were not willing to undergo, and incalculable loss to successive generations of students. Palma was the best class-book to be found in Latin; but it was hard to procure, and is very incomplete as a history. It is a collection of dissertations on detached historical subjects, admirable of their kind, but which do not show us the march of historical events in their synthetic unity. This is an objection that cannot be urged against Alzog. According to him, "Church history, in its objective sense, is an explanation of the origin and growth of the kingdom of God on earth, of its progress and spread from age to age, during both the period of preparation before Christ and of fulfilment after; and, in particular, a statement of the foundation, nature, development, and vicissitudes of the Church of Christ, the regeneration of man, and his gradual union with God, through Christ, in the Holy Ghost;" and, in the progress of his work, he loses sight of no particular matter involved in this true and philosophical conception of his subject. The ancient world and its relations to Christianity, the life and labors of Christ, the history of the apostles, the form and constitution of the Church, Christian life, worship, discipline, persecutions, heresies, missions, councils, doctrinal developments, ecclesiastical writers, the aim and growth of religious orders,—all these, and other important facts in the history of the Church, he notes and discusses, briefly, it is true, but with such abundant references to standard sources of information on each particular topic, that any one desirous of pursuing it further, can do so to his heart's content.

His Scientific Introduction—on the nature, division, and sources of Church history and historical criticism—is admirably adapted to prepare the student to fully profit by the study of the work, and to train his mind to habits of criticism that will be invaluable to him in his more extended historical studies afterwards. All through the book, he is kept in mind of the principles laid down in this Introduction, by signs affixed to the names of the authors cited in the footnotes, and which determine the intellectual and moral weight of each in particular.

We are happy to be able to congratulate the learned translators on the manner in which they have done their work. Their task was a most difficult one, but they have, thus far, performed it faithfully and well. Their success in putting into intelligible and idiomatic English the Scientific Introduction just referred to, is of itself an achievement for which they deserve the highest praise; but the notes, additions, and amplifications by which they have elucidated and enriched the body of the work show more clearly still the reach and value of their labors.

The style, in which the two volumes have been brought out, is all that

could be desired. The price ($5 a volume) is undoubtedly high for a book so much needed by a class whose means are generally very limited; but, taking into account the nature and variety of the work to be done by the publishers, we are surprised that they have been able to put it at so low a figure. The volumes, though well adapted for library use, are rather too heavy and unwieldy for the class-room. For this reason, we think, in future editions of the work, it would be an improvement to bind each volume in two separate parts.

Ritter's *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, in two volumes, would be a more convenient class-book. It is written on the same plan as Alzog's, but is clearer and much more concise. Still, it would hardly suffice for a three years' course, and, if we are not mistaken, it is disfigured by prejudices and opinions that would make it unacceptable to entirely orthodox readers.

A History of Ancient and Modern Philosophy. By *Joseph Haven*, D.D., LL.D. New York: Sheldon & Co. 1876. Pp. 416.

This book seems to have grown out of the author's lecture-notes. It may be regarded as a series of popular lectures on the history of philosophy. The style is imbued with Germanisms. For the beginner in philosophical studies the book contains much useful and sound information so far as the mere statement of facts is concerned. This is especially true of the part treating of ancient philosophy. The chapters on Plato and Aristotle are exceptionally good; though in them is to be found little or nothing that marks the author's originality. Perhaps they are good because the author did not strike on an independent line of treatment. We learn from the preface that the author brought to bear a certain amount of enthusiasm on his subject, and that he has written three other works which have had a favorable reception. And still, judging from the book before us, we can safely say that he lived and died talking and discussing his favorite theme without a proper conception of philosophy in its bearings and relations. He had learned to repeat systems and remember facts with more or less accuracy; but to think philosophically was beyond the grasp of his intellect. He is unable to go back of a system in order to determine what in it is good and what is bad.

We consider it unphilosophical in the author to break the *nexus* between the East and the West, and to begin with the philosophy of Greece. True, he quotes Schwegler for the precedent, but that does not in the least mend his case. Whatever of good Greece had in her system, was imparted to her by the East. Her sophistries were her own. Egypt, Palestine, Chaldea, each contributed its share to build up the thoughtful theories of Pythagoras and the lofty ideal of Plato. Philosophy is meaningless apart from the profounder questionings of theology, even as man without God would be an anomaly.

When the author breaks away from the plain unvarnished tale to comment upon it, he is frequently illogical. Here is an instance: He says on page 71, "The sophists were of great use in philosophy;" and in explaining how, he adds: "They taught men to doubt, and so made them more cautious ultimately in philosophizing." He further tells us that "they prepared the way" for Socrates. As well might he have said that a plague is physically useful, that tares prepare the way for the good grain, in a word that evil is good. A Socrates was needed; but assuredly he was not, as the author would have us to infer, the outcome of sophistry. He was needed as the physician is needed for the dis-

ease, as the husbandman is needed for the field overrun by briers and thorns, as the sun is needed to dispel the darkness of night. And then a Socrates could not create truth; he could only lead back to it from the paths of error into which the sophists had led men.

Again, on page 194, Dr. Haven asks, "What was the result now of all these profound investigations from Thales downward?" And he answers: "They are the germ of modern philosophy, the seeds of things, the dawn of a brighter, higher day, that shines on us; our eyes behold what these old kings and prophets of the mental world desired to see, but died without the sight" (p. 195). With Hamlet, we call this "words, words," meaningless words. Not to stop at the bad composition, we must say that it admirably illustrates the author's philosophical obtuseness. He seems not to know that philosophical speculation is as much a necessity, with a people of education, as is thought itself; that all these questionings are the oscillations of man's soul away from its final resting-place; that they are yearnings of the intellect to fulfil the law of knowing, to which it is subject. He seems not to know that these speculations in one shape or other were the determining principle of men's lives and actions; that thoughts invariably become facts; that the idea which yesterday was an object of curiosity, has to-day become a hotly contested problem, and to-morrow will be an impelling force driving men to action for good or for ill. The absence of such knowledge proves his inability to treat the history of thought.

Still another instance of philosophical obtuseness. On page 241, speaking of the characteristic feature of the Cartesian system, the author says: "The *starting-point* of the whole system, the *basis* of all belief and certainty, is *doubt*." (The *italicizing* is the author's.) Shade of Descartes! Was it for this you wrote so clearly and beautifully, that it should be said of you that you made *doubt* the *basis* of your philosophy? Was it with prophetic vision, in which you saw Dr. Haven dabbling with your system and misinterpreting it to this extent, that you requested none to read your books but those disposed to think? The philosophic sins of Descartes are many, but this piece of absurdity is not one of them. The fact of consciousness expressed in the famous formula, *Cogito, ergo sum*, and the principle of evidence form the basis of the Cartesian system.

We now pass to the final question to be answered in connection with the book under review, viz.: Can we recommend it to our Catholic institutions of learning? How does it treat the great masters we would have our Catholic youth know and revere? There is a chapter devoted to scholastic philosophy; but it is evident the author has very little sympathy with the subject. He has not the least idea of the value of scholasticism. It is to him a dry skeleton. His ideas of it are drawn from the history of scholasticism, not from a sympathizing study of its great masters. St. Thomas's beautiful method and profound reasoning were unknown to him. At least he shows no appreciation of the Angelic Doctor. The author reveals his true animus towards the great mediæval philosophers on page 217. There he announces an important discovery which he has made. He tells us that in the days of Bacon "men were beginning to think for themselves independently of ecclesiastical dictation and the authority of the fathers." Remember, "beginning to think"! This was in the latter part of the sixteenth century; Bacon was born in 1561. So it is now an ascertained fact that up to that time men did not think for themselves. Gerbert did not think for himself! Of course not; neither did Roger Bacon, even though he did anticipate in detail the inductive method of Francis Bacon; neither

did St. Anselm, though he dictated the proof of the existence of God, with which Descartes is frequently credited; neither did Albertus Magnus, who could find no public hall large enough for the audiences that hung on his lips; nor Thomas Aquinas, the greatest genius of mediæval times! This is news indeed, and news enough. We close the book lest we hit upon something still more wonderful. Catholic youth require more wholesome food than that prepared by Dr. Haven.

MATHILDA OF CANOSSA, AND YOLAND OF GRONINGEN. By *Rev. A. Bresciani, S.J.*, Author of "The Jew of Verona," "Leonello," etc. Translated by *Anna T. Sadlier.* New York: D. & J. Sadlier & Co., 31 Barclay Street. Montreal: 275 Notre Dame Street. 1875.

This story carries us back to the gloomiest period of Italian and German history. European nations were then emerging from the barbarism that followed the downfall of the Roman Empire. International wars were as yet unknown; but civil strife was the normal condition of every country. Feudalism had just been consolidated into the forms it retained down to the fourteenth century, and was spending itself in fierce and sanguinary contests between vassals and their lords, and between the latter and their sovereigns. In the Church the condition of things was most deplorable. The system of lay investitutures had practically secularized the great majority of the bishops in all European countries. They had become mere civil lords, more familiar with the sword than the crozier, with the helmet than the mitre. Had Richard of England lived about the middle of the eleventh century, and sent to Leo IX., instead of Celestine, the coat of mail of a Philip, bishop of Beauvais, with the request: "Look, if this be the coat of thy son, or not!" he would hardly have received for answer: "No, it is the coat of a son of Mars; let Mars deliver him, if he can." In that century, bishoprics, abbacies, benefices of every kind, holy orders, were bought and sold with little regard to the qualifications, intellectual or moral, of the recipients. Licentiousness soon became as widespread as simony; and schism, inaugurated to perpetuate both, threatened for awhile the unity itself of the Western Church. There were not wanting bold and generous spirits, who, like St. Peter Damian, denounced in no measured terms the disorders of the time; nor others, who sought to heal them by the more violent remedy of the sword. But their efforts would have been in vain, had not the genius and the indomitable courage of a Hildebrand been brought to the rescue of religion and social order. He thoroughly understood the magnitude of the struggle in which the Church was engaged. He knew that the question at issue was, whether she should remain Catholic and free, such as her Divine Founder had made her, or become national and the handmaid and slave of the civil power, and, ultimately, be torn into as many sects as there would be petty rulers in each kingdom to usurp her authority. That authority once lost, the great Pontiff felt nothing else would remain that could hold in check the fierce spirit of that semi-barbarous age, or keep society from plunging back into the chaos from which the Church had called it. What he did to meet the exigencies of the time, how he labored, both before and after his elevation to the pontificate to remove abuses, to restore discipline among the clergy, to give freedom to the Church, and peace and protection to oppressed nationalities, we need not tell the reader. These things are among the facts of mediæval history with which all are familiar.

The object of the volume before us is to bring out the real nature of

the struggle between St. Gregory and Henry IV., to describe the important part taken by the Countess Mathilda in that struggle, and to show us, in the person of a noble woman, a brilliant example of heroic fidelity to the Holy See under the most trying circumstances. This it does with singular ability and success. It does not, like most of our historical novels, give us fiction in the form of history, but history in the dress of fiction. It is truly a historical romance. The real heroine is not Mathilda of Canossa, but Yoland of Groningen, a German countess. This selection of a heroine interferes very materially with the unity of the story, but it was necessary to the object the author had in view. In point of fact, Mathilda had never been in Germany, and it would have been very difficult, if not impossible, to depict Henry in his true colors, had not a good part of the scene been laid in that country. In the estimation of those who read for something more than mere excitement or pastime, this defect will be more than compensated by the truth and beauty of the narrative, the insight it gives into the domestic, monastic, and court life of the eleventh century, the extraordinary antiquarian research displayed by the author, and the clearness, precision, and force with which he states and argues the questions at issue between the Church and the Empire in the days of which he writes.

With the exception of a few verbal mistranslations, clearly the result of inadvertence, the story has been faithfully rendered into our vernacular, and in such style as might lead one to suppose that it had been originally written in English.

LES DROITS DE DIEU ET LES IDEES MODERNES. Par *l'Abbé François Chesnel*, Vicaire Général de Quimper, Paris et Poitiers: Henri Oudin. 1875. 8vo., pp. 394.

Our Christian ancestors for fifteen or more hundred years had a great deal to say about the duties of man, duties towards God, the state, the family, and his fellow-man. To know those duties accurately was considered the height of Christian wisdom; to perform them faithfully was the perfection of Christian life. They were taught in the schools, they were inculcated from the pulpit; they formed the material of ponderous treatises for the learned, and of homely manuals for the humbler classes. But, ever since the great religious revolt of the sixteenth century has begun to develop its pernicious fruits, all this has been changed. A new language has been introduced; and we hear no more of *duties*, but of *rights*. We hear of the right of free thought, the right of free speech, the right to freedom without limit in the political order. And from this, with fearful but logical steps, the claim has extended to freedom in the social and moral order. Some, alarmed at the result of their own wild theories, are trying to draw back; but the logical wave they set in motion will not return at their bidding. The consequence is that Europe sees at this day, and our own country may soon see, a numerous and formidable party of men, who have progressed from the rights of free thought and free speech to the right of free pillage and bloodshed. And meanwhile, amidst all this silly, criminal prattle about the rights of man, nothing is ever heard about the sovereign rights of God, as if the Lord and Master of all stood among his creatures alone without a right that they will recognize.

This is what seems to have roused the indignant zeal of the worthy author of the book before us, as its very title shows. He divides his work into three parts or books. The first treats of the absolute sover-

eignty of God over man, whether individually or socially considered. This may sound to most persons a very simple, plain truth; and so it is. But man needs to be recalled perpetually to the acknowledgment of this elementary truth. Its denial is at the bottom of all the evils that weigh so heavily on our humanity. However clear to right reason it may be, it is an unpleasant truth; and the will rejects it first, and then tries to darken its light in the eyes of the understanding. Satan and his rebellious crew in heaven, and afterwards our first parents in Eden, found this yoke of the Divine sovereignty as unbearable, as do the Liberals and Freemasons of Europe in our day. Some who pretend to moderation, while admiting God's sovereignty over the individual, will not allow it over the social man. And this is the basis of State worship, which is the practical Atheism of our times, the curse that is desolating Europe and threatens, even now, to invade our own country. In the course of his argument the author shows that the State, like all creatures, must be limited. He discusses and defines the limits of its power, and enumerates its duties, which, he says, may be reduced to two general heads, Religion and Justice.

This is the only part that has yet appeared, and the author intimates that the issuing of the other two will depend on the reception that may be given to his first essay by the public. The work is generally written not only with that clearness which results from the "*lucidus ordo*," but also with solidity. We must say, however, that the form into which he has thrown his book, that of a dialogue between master and scholar, is open to objection. Not that the dialogue may not be used to great advantage in religious or philosophical discussion, for the examples of the great masters of antiquity, Plato, Cicero, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, and others, are proof to the contrary. But the interlocutor to be convinced should be on an equal footing; he should be an adversary who reasons, not a disciple who learns. The remarks of the scholar would seem, in some places, to lengthen the dialogue uselessly, if not tediously. And, even if it had the laconic brevity of a Catechism, the catechetical form would scarcely be available in our day against the enemies of the Church, to confound or convert whom the book has been written.

CHARACTERISTICS FROM THE WRITINGS OF JOHN HENRY NEWMAN. Arranged by *Samuel Lilly*, of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-law, with the Author's approval. New York: D. & J. Sadlier & Co. 1876.

This volume ought to be, and, no doubt, will be, most welcome to American Catholic readers. As far as we know Catholic opinion in the United States, there is no writer in our language so much admired here as Dr. Newman. This we consider complimentary in no slight degree to American Catholics. Among the learned everywhere he is admitted to be the greatest intellect of the age, and one who has had very few superiors in any age; but that he should be so regarded by all classes of Catholics in this country is a proof of their ability to appreciate mental gifts of the very highest order, even when used in a manner not calculated, nor even intended, to captivate the masses. Dr. Newman is assuredly not a popular writer or preacher in the ordinary meaning of the term. Yet his sermons and lectures are read here with no less pleasure than profit, by the least as well as by the most cultivated classes. How is this to be accounted for? Only by the fact that with faith there comes an infused logic or intuition of truth, more or less vivid, as faith

itself is allowed to influence our conduct, and which, in the apprehending of moral and revealed truth, does for Catholics what reflection and study are not able to accomplish in others. We once heard Dr. Brownson say that what he considered the nice points in his philosophical lectures, he had always found to be best appreciated by Catholic audiences composed chiefly of the working classes; and we all remember how instantaneously audiences of this kind were wont to respond to the keen and elevated satire of Dr. Marshall four years ago.

But it is not the intellectual gifts only of the great Oratorian that are appreciated on this side of the Atlantic. The many beautiful traits of character revealed in his writings, but fully understood only by those who have known the charm of his society, have enkindled a love for him in the hearts of our people greater than is felt by them for any other living author. His candor, his humility, his charity, his love of country, the strength and tenderness of his friendships, the sacrifices he has made, the sufferings he has endured for the truth and for fidelity to his convictions of duty, are claims to the affectionate regard of all men, long since recognized and felt by Catholics in America.

This volume of "Selections" enables one to form a better idea of Dr. Newman's character and intellectual ability than a desultory reading of detached productions of his could possibly give. It tells us, in his own words, the history of his religious thought from boyhood till his conversion in 1845, and of his earnest though fruitless efforts to find a theological basis for Church of Englandism. It presents him to us as a philosopher, historian, theologian, preacher, and lecturer, showing us, as it were, at one glance, the depth, brilliancy, and versatility of his talents in these various capacities. And yet, there are many other points of view in which he might be made to appear to no less advantage, about which this volume is silent. His knowledge of the Greek and Latin classics, especially of the former, is said by those who know him best to be most profound. His "Church of the Fathers" is a masterpiece in the line of hagiography. "Calista" is, we think, unequalled, as a work of fiction, in any language. His verses show him to be a true poet, and we have it on very good authority that he is an accomplished musician. About the time of his conversion he broke into fragments a valuable Cremona, which, for long years, had been the solace of his lonely hours and less cheerful moods. It is needless to say in what spirit he made this sacrifice of an object so dear to him.

But the chief merit of these selections is yet to be told. They are a collection of thoughts, sometimes brilliant, often original, always beautiful and suggestive, on a variety of subjects connected with the philosophical and theological issues of the present time, clothed in exquisite language by the greatest living master of style. Each separate extract is either a sketch that will be remembered as a masterpiece, or an analysis exhaustive in its reach, startling in its distinctness, or an argument that leaves absolutely nothing to be subsumed or said by an opponent of the truth.

To say that this volume is worth its weight in gold would be to give but a faint indication of its worth. We consider it the most valuable addition ever made to English Catholic literature. It is a book that must live, as a classic, as a model of style, and as an authority on the subjects discussed in it, as long as the English language is spoken or understood.

We wish the Messrs. Sadlier had given it to us in larger and better type, and with as few typographical errors as are usually found in their publications.

THE STUDENT'S HANDBOOK OF BRITISH AND AMERICAN LITERATURE. Containing sketches, biographical and critical, of the most distinguished English authors from the earliest times to the present day; with selections from their writings and questions, adapted to the use of schools. By *Rev. O. T. Jenkins, A.M.*, late President of St. Charles's College, Ellicott City, Md., and formerly President of St. Mary's College, Baltimore. 12mo., pp. 564. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co. 1876.

The compiler's intention, as we are informed in the preface, was to prepare a text-book of British and American literature "which, in its general bearing, would be free from sectarian views and influences, and, in the extracts, be entirely unexceptionable in point of morality." The general object, then, is most praiseworthy—to reform, or rather to do away altogether with that system of text-books which has prevailed too long, and in which Catholic authors are carefully ignored and excluded, as if they had contributed nothing to literature worthy of preservation and study. But if, besides the recalling of Catholic works to their legitimate place in education, it be further intended to eliminate from the extracts everything that is distinctively Catholic—on the same grounds that whatever is offensively anti-Catholic is expunged from Protestant authors—the new system will not be generally approved. It is an improvement on the old, but it is far from what it ought to be; and though something perhaps may be said in its favor, we can scarcely reconcile ourselves to it for more reasons than one. In the first place literature itself would be the loser, for the highest degree of æsthetic beauty may be found in what is distinctively Catholic. What would become of "Evangeline" if its peculiarly Catholic features were to be swept aside by this critical besom? Not only the beauty, but the very life of the poem would be destroyed. Besides, a text-book like the present, which deals out some small measure of justice to our authors, is scarcely likely to meet countenance and obtain circulation outside of our own schools and colleges.

The remarks and criticisms of Father Jenkins are often elegantly expressed; they always show good taste and correct judgment. But in a book of this kind the work of selection is far more difficult than that of critical judgment, and will be rarely found to please all, or a majority of readers. They are more apt to note defects on this score, than the many excellencies of a text-book. And, indeed, it must be admitted that on this point the work before us is open to criticism. It seems to have been only a first sketch, and doubtless would have been considerably enlarged had the author lived to perfect his plan. But the editor might have remedied the defect. Why, for example, should there be no mention of the great parliamentary orators, Chatham, Sheridan, Grattan, and others? Names are wanting, even in the literature of our own country, to which obscurer names might have been made to give place. And in a book for a Catholic college the memory of the gentle Crashaw, whom Cowley saluted as "poet and saint," and of the author of the "Virgin Martyr," ought to have been preserved. Men too amongst us, like Brownson, the author of "Mohammed" and others, whom we could name, have been strangely overlooked.

If Father Jenkins's work should ever be reprinted, and we hope it may, it would not be amiss to add a supplement, which will make up for present deficiencies. Indeed, it is only by this method that such books are generally brought to some degree of perfection. The typography, binding, etc., are in Mr. Murphy's usual excellent style.

[*Owing to the length of several articles in the present number, the space devoted to this Department of the Review has been necessarily curtailed, and a number of notices of recent publications are, therefore, held over until our next issue.*]

PERIODICAL

70734

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

DOES NOT CIRCULATE